

***WEAVING TIES OF FRIENDSHIP, TRUST,
AND COMMITMENT TO BUILD
DEMOCRACY AND HUMAN RIGHTS
IN PERU***

***A CASE STUDY OF A TRAINING PROGRAM FOR COMMUNITY LEADERS IN
HUMAN RIGHTS, DEMOCRACY AND CITIZEN PARTICIPATION OF THE
PERUVIAN INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATION IN HUMAN RIGHTS AND PEACE
(IPEDEHP)***

Prepared by:

Marcia Bernbaum

February, 1999

SONG TO LIBERTY¹

*There will be a day in which everyone
As they look up
Will see a land
Where there is liberty (refrain)*

*Brother, take my hand
I will dare with you and as always
Your bravery will raise
Strong winds of fear
To face liberty.*

*We will forge the road
In the same direction
Uniting our shoulders
In order to pick up
Those who fell
Shouting for liberty*

*The bells will ring
From the bell towers
And the deserted countryside
Will again be planted
With large ears of wheat
Ready to be made into bread*

*For a bread that throughout the centuries
Was never shared
Among all of those
Who did everything possible
To push history
Toward liberty*

*It is also possible
That upon this beautiful day
Neither you, nor I, nor the other
Will ever see it
But we must push
So that it will come to be*

*That it be like a wind
That roots out the shrubs
Out of which will come the truth
And the roads will be cleaned
Of centuries of destruction
Against liberty*

¹ This song was written by a Spaniard, Jose Antonio Labordeta, during the 1970s. It was sung by the participants of the first IPEDEHP training course in human rights given in Cajamarca in 1986. Since then it has been symbolic for IPEDEHP.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTORY NOTE FROM THE AUTHOR	i
SUMMARY	iii
I. OPENING	1
II. FOCUS AND ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY	4
III. STUDY METHODOLOGY	6
IV. EVOLUTION OF THE CONTEXT WITHIN WHICH IPEDEHP HAS WORKED BETWEEN 1985 AND THE PRESENT	11
V. IPEDEHP SEEN FROM WITHIN AND WITHOUT	14
VI. A FOCUS ON IPEDEHP'S PROGRAM TO TRAIN COMMUNITY LEADERS IN HUMAN RIGHTS, DEMOCRACY, AND CITIZEN PARTICIPATION	24
-- <i>Structure/organization of the training program</i>	25
-- <i>An attempt to share the "flavor" of the training course</i>	30
-- <i>Tools that course graduates take with them when they go back to their communities</i>	36
VII. THE IMPACT OF IPEDEHP'S WORK SEEN FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF ITS TRAINING PROGRAM FOR COMMUNITY LEADERS: RESULTS OF A FIELD STUDY	38
-- <i>Information available on the community leaders in the four Departments visited before carrying out the field study</i>	38
-- <i>Profile of the 20 people selected to participate in the field study</i>	39
-- <i>Insights from the field study</i>	41
VIII. LESSONS LEARNED FROM IPEDEHP'S EXPERIENCE	56
-- <i>Elements of IPEDEHP's strategy which have contributed to its effectiveness</i>	57
-- <i>Challenges faced by IPEDEHP and other organizations that wish to do something similar</i>	60
IX. WHY SUPPORT IN PERU AND OTHER COUNTRIES TRAINING PROGRAMS IN HUMAN RIGHTS AND DEMOCRACY THAT APPLY STRATEGIES AND METHODOLOGIES SIMILAR TO THOSE USED BY IPEDEHP	67
X. CONCLUDING REMARKS	70

ANNEXES	74
A. FOUR CASES	75
B. PEOPLE INTERVIEWED	87
C. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	90
D. BIBLIOGRAPHY	92
E. ABOUT THE AUTHOR OF THE STUDY	96
F. INSTRUCTIONS FOR ORDERING COPIES OF THE STUDY	97

INTRODUCTORY NOTE FROM THE AUTHOR

In February, 1997 I had the opportunity to visit Peru. I met with a variety of civil society organizations located in Lima that have as their key objective achieving fundamental changes in the Peruvian social system. One of these organizations was the Peruvian Institute of Human Rights and Peace (IPEDEHP), founded in 1985.

I came away from my visit to Peru very impressed with most of the organizations that I visited. However, I was particularly intrigued with IPEDEHP. The enthusiasm of the IPEDEHP team over what they are doing is contagious. I was also very impressed with the quality and creativity of their materials.

During a second visit to Peru in August of 1997 I approached IPEDEHP and offered to carry out a case study on their institution. I had three motivations for making this offer:

- 1. Satisfy my professional curiosity. It appeared to me, from what I had seen and heard about IPEDEHP during my visit to Peru in February, that I had a great deal to learn from their approach.*
- 2. Apply, within the context of the IPEDEHP experience, a qualitative methodology that I think may be of value in evaluating programs such as IPEDEHP's that promote leadership, self-esteem and empowerment.*
- 3. Share with a broader audience within and outside of Peru lessons learned from the IPEDEHP experience that might be useful for other organizations with similar objectives.*

The United States Agency for International Development (USAID) in Peru financed, under a small grant to IPEDEHP, my transportation to and from Peru and my travel and living expenses while in Peru. They also financed the publication and dissemination of the study. I donated my time to: design the study, do the data collection and analysis, and draft the report.

This report is directed to three primary audiences:

- 1. Other organization working in the field of training in human rights, democracy and peace that are interested in learning from the IPEDEHP experience.*
- 2. Members of the human rights community that would like to explore the role that a training program in human rights of the type offered by IPEDEHP can contribute to the promotion and defense of human rights.*
- 3. Groups in other countries that are working with populations affected by violence.*

I would like to make four comments before presenting the study results:

- 1. This study addresses a training program in human rights, democracy and citizen participation that is oriented toward application and action. It is not a series of theoretical classes carried out where the professor lectures to students on what their rights are and what the Peruvian Constitution has to say about their rights. In this program, directed toward community leaders, participants learn by doing: by active participation in human*

rights and democracy games, group dynamics, preparing role plays. They build, with their colleagues, their own concepts of human rights and democracy based on their own experiences. At the end of the training participants are prepared to return to their communities to share with others what they have learned. Most organize and deliver training programs in human rights and democracy. In addition, many organize and participate in radio and television programs. Some form Human Rights Committees to counsel people on their rights and help them deal with rights violations.

2. *This is a case study, not a program evaluation. Its objective is to explore the impact that a training program such as that offered by IPEDEHP can have on the community leaders it trains, members of their families, and individuals they influence upon returning to their communities. If my objective had been to carry out a programmatic evaluation of IPEDEHP's community leaders program I would have done at least two things differently: (1) I would have selected a sample of community leaders in a totally random fashion instead of deliberately choosing individuals who, upon returning to their communities, applied what they learned in the course; (2) I would have entered in much more depth into the internal management of this program.*
3. *In the ideal world this would be one of a series of studies on organizations in Peru that are committed to promoting and defending human rights. Peru has a large number of impressive NGOs who, in response to the violence that began in the early 1980s, have individually and collectively through networks (such as the National Coordinator on Human Rights and the Peruvian Network for Education in Human Rights and Peace) taken decisive actions to counteract this violence. I hope that this case study serves as an inspiration for carrying out other studies about these organizations as well as these two important networks.*
4. *Due to the way IPEDEHP is structured and the way it works, doing a case study on IPEDEHP means focusing on many other organizations and people in Peru. One of IPEDEHP's strengths is that, from its beginning, it has adopted a conscious strategy of working closely with others that work in human rights. IPEDEHP was one of the founders of the Peruvian Network for Education in Human Rights and Peace. Since it was founded in 1985 IPEDEHP has shared its materials and its training methodologies with others. When IPEDEHP needs help from others to carry out its activities, as has occurred with the community leaders program which forms the focus of this study, IPEDEHP has always been able to count on their collaboration.*

It is precisely this way of working—"weaving ties of friendship, trust, and commitment"-- which symbolizes the work of IPEDEHP and has inspired the title of this case study.

*Marcia Bernbaum, Ph.D.
February, 1999*

SUMMARY

BACKGROUND

Starting in the early 1980's and well into the 1990s Peru was rocked by violence: from terrorists (the Shining Path, the MRTA), from narco-traffickers, and from the Peruvian military responding to the terrorists and narco-traffickers. This violence, during a fourteen year period (between 1980 and 1994), left 25,000 Peruvians dead and thousands of innocent Peruvians imprisoned under suspicion of being terrorists. Over 6,000 people disappeared and hundreds of thousands of families were displaced. The social fabric in areas where terrorism was at its peak was disrupted as community leaders (mayors, teachers, heads of women's clubs) were systematically murdered. At the same time the Peruvian economy suffered a decline that had no equal in the rest of Latin America. In 1989 the minimum wage in Peru purchased 23% of what the Peruvian minimum wage could purchase in 1980.

Most affected by the decline in the economy and the violence were Peru's poor—individuals from the highlands and the jungles as well as those living in marginal areas of Lima, Peru's capital. These individuals, many with low levels of education, did not know what their rights were, how to defend them, or where to go when they were violated. Frustrated by their declining purchasing power, many internalized the aftermath of the violence and their economic frustration within their families. While there are no hard data to support this, a common belief is that—as a result of economic decline and the violence from terrorism—family violence (men beating and otherwise abusing their wives; parents beating and otherwise abusing their children) has increased.

1985 was a very important year for Peru as it was during this year that civil society organized to fight the violence. The National Coordinator for Human Rights—a coalition of over 50 NGOs supporting the rights of Peruvians—was formed to repudiate violence “from wherever it might come”. Also in 1985 the Peruvian Institute for Education in Human Rights and Peace (IPEDEHP), an active member of the National Coordinator for Human Rights, was born. Both organizations are highly respected by those in the human rights community within and outside of Peru for what they have done over the past decade to defend the rights of Peruvian citizens. Today, 13 years later, both organizations are still vigorously defending the rights of Peruvian citizens as outlined in the International Declaration of Human Rights, the Peruvian Constitution and other Peruvian laws.

IPEDEHP: THE PERUVIAN INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATION IN HUMAN RIGHTS AND PEACE

IPEDEHP is composed of a group of educators, with backgrounds working in the Ministry of Education and in popular education, who met through their common interest in human rights as members of Amnesty International in the early 1980s. All have been influenced by the philosophy and teachings of Paulo Freire, a well known Brazilian educator. For its first ten years IPEDEHP focused on teachers who had been particularly affected by the violence. It remains a small group of seven professionals, most of whom were founders of the organization. IPEDEHP staff share a clear vision, a common set of values, and are clear on their roles and responsibilities. They are constantly critiquing their own processes, building on and learning

from both their successes and their errors, and adapting the contents of their training programs in human rights and democracy to reflect changing times in Peru.

To date IPEDEHP has trained over 13,000 teachers in human rights and democracy. It has also established a cadre of 250 human rights promoters, themselves teachers, who have provided training to thousands more teachers in human rights and democracy. It enjoys, both within and outside of Peru, the reputation of being a serious organization that provides excellent training, actively networks with other groups, and that reaches out to others to share its methodologies and materials. A year after it was established (in 1986) IPEDEHP took the lead in establishing a Peruvian Human Rights Education Network which, 12 years later, remains active. The network, which IPEDEHP continues to nurture, is made up of 70 organizations that work in human rights education throughout Peru. The Peruvian Human Rights Education Network incorporates most of the members of the National Coordinator on Human Rights and is known as its educational arm.

IPEDEHP'S TRAINING PROGRAM FOR COMMUNITY LEADERS

In 1996 IPEDEHP, building on its decade of experience providing training in human rights and democracy to teachers, extended its program to community leaders. With financing from USAID/Peru it designed a course in human rights, democracy, and citizen participation entitled: *"You Have Rights: Know Them, Defend Them, Promote Them"*. Over a three day period participants are introduced to basic concepts of human rights, democracy, citizen participation and interactive training methodologies that they can take back to their communities to replicate what they have learned at the course. Following the course, IPEDEHP—in close coordination with local members of the Peruvian Human Rights Education Network (also members of the Human Rights Coordinator) who are responsible for identifying leaders in their regions to attend the course—provides active follow up consisting of periodic evaluation meetings where course graduates are provided with additional skills.

While IPEDEHP takes the lead and does the actual training, its two partners -- the National Coordinator on Human Rights and the recently established Office of the Human Rights Ombudsman established by the Peruvian Congress in 1996 – also play a key role. Their presence at the course motivates the participants; familiarizes them with the services they provide; legitimizes their actions once they return to their communities; and encourages them to tap on the services both organizations provide when they return to their communities.

To date nearly 900 community leaders from 11 Departments of Peru (mountains, jungle, coast) have participated in this training program.

SPECIAL FEATURES OF IPEDEHP'S PROGRAM TO TRAIN COMMUNITY LEADERS

There are several features of IPEDEHP's training program for community leaders in human rights, democracy, and citizen participation that make it stand out as a very effective program that is worth replicating outside of Peru:

- ***IPEDEHP offers an integral program of education-action*** which touches on the core values of dignity, respect, equality, tolerance and self-esteem as they apply to the daily lives of the course participants. The emphasis on fundamental values creates a strong commitment, when the leaders return to their communities, to apply what they have learned.

- ***The course involves more than just a one shot training experience.*** Long before the course is delivered in a given area of the country, IPEDEHP enters into an agreement with counterpart organizations at the community level (most are members of the National Coordinator on Human Rights and/or the Peruvian Network for Education in Human Rights and Peace) to identify leaders in their communities and motivate them to replicate what they have learned after receiving the training. Representatives of the counterpart organizations attend the IPEDEHP training course with the community leaders and, in collaboration with IPEDEHP, provide follow up to the leaders once they return to their communities. As a Peruvian priest who has been affiliated with IPEDEHP since its inception described it, “*The three day course is the spark that ignites the motor. The gasoline (follow-up) is added once the car gets on the road.*”
- ***All learning is closely linked to the participants daily lives.*** While attending the course participants acquire knowledge of human rights and democracy by sharing their own experiences. It is only after building their own concepts based on their collective experiences that they are introduced to the theory behind these concepts. Upon completing the course they return to their communities to apply what they have learned in the context of the needs and realities of their communities.
- ***IPEDEHP’s training program is highly interactive.*** Learning takes place through action. Participants are constantly involved in group dynamics, they play human rights and democracy games, there are role plays and songs and small group discussions. There is hardly a moment during the three day course and follow-up sessions when participants are sitting listening to the trainers give them a lecture.
- ***Community leaders leave the course with a practical and easy to use tool kit of materials to guide the application of what they learned in the course once they return to their communities.*** This tool kit consists of human rights and democracy games; an easy to use methodological guide; a summary of the principals underlying the training methodology used; and a set of easy to read guidelines on what each of the rights are, what the International Declaration on Human Rights, the Peruvian Constitution and other Peruvian laws have to say about these rights, and what should be done when they are violated.
- ***Everybody gets something out of the training course.*** Some acquire, for the first time, knowledge of what their rights are and what democracy is while for others the course provides an opportunity to update their existing concepts on human rights and democracy. Everybody acquires skills in applying interactive training methodologies that make them more effective multipliers when they return to their communities. New friendships are made, often with people that the leaders would never otherwise have had an opportunity to meet.

Four characteristics make the IPEDEHP training methodology particularly appropriate to be used in societies that have gone through or are experiencing violence:

- ***The training promotes the development and expression of the affective.*** During the training course participants are encouraged to share their feelings, their fears, and their hopes related to the themes of human rights, democracy, and citizen participation. Given that many of the participants have themselves been victims of the violence over the last decade, having

an opportunity to express and work through their feelings in an accepting atmosphere is fundamental.

- ***The practice of human rights and democracy begins from within.*** Participants begin by examining themselves—the extent to which they are being democratic in their households and communities, the extent to which they are upholding basic human rights. It is only after they have looked at themselves in a mirror that they can begin to look outside to see how democracy and rights are being practiced in their own communities and in Peru in general.
- ***A key strength of the training course is in the heterogeneity of the participants.*** Lawyers, social workers and teachers play games and do role plays with community leaders who have less than a primary education. At the beginning of the course the lawyer looks at the lady from the woman's club with three years primary education and asks himself “why am I here with her?”. The lady with three years primary education looks at the lawyer and thinks to herself “I feel so insignificant”. By the end of the first morning the lawyer and the have each discovered they have a great deal to learn from each other.
- ***Building networks of friendship, trust and commitment.*** Individuals who, in many cases, would never have had a chance to meet interact, learn together in an open and supportive atmosphere that practices all of the fundamental principles of democracy and human rights. In so doing—they break down stereotypes and barriers of mistrust and begin to build friendships. During the course and in the extensive follow-up subsequent to the course every effort is made to strengthen the friendships and bonds of trust that have been forged at the course through establishing networks—among course graduates who work in the same communities, graduates at the regional level, as well as at the national level.

A STUDY TO IDENTIFY THE IMPACT OF IPEDEHP'S PROGRAM TO TRAIN COMMUNITY LEADERS

USAID/Peru recently provided partial financing (travel expenses to and from Peru and living expenses while in Peru) for a field study to assess the impact of this program on the 900 community leaders, their families, and the individuals they influenced upon returning to their communities (I donated my time to carry out the field study).

Two complementary approaches were used to collect the field data for this study:

- During the month of May, 1998 and then again in September, 1998, I traveled to different regions of Peru ² where I interviewed 20 of 900 community leaders that have been trained under this program, their spouses and children (where available), and from 3-4 individuals in the community who had been affected by the community leader after he/she received the training. ³ In selecting the sample and in doing the subsequent data analysis I used three variables: gender, geographic location (highlands, jungle, areas that did and did not experience violence), and size of community (from 5,000-8,000 to 500,000). I also collected, and used in the analysis, data on: age, education level, occupation. In order to do the analysis, I grouped data around key interview themes (e.g. views on the training received,

² The highlands that had been affected by the terrorism of the Shining Path and the military, the jungles that had been affected by the terrorism of the Tupac Amaru guerrilla movement, narco-traffickers, and the military, and a region that had not been affected by the violence.

³ A total of approximately 100 interviews.

personal impact), coded the data and came up with frequencies of occurrence of phenomena that emerged in the data (e.g. in the case of personal impact: frequency with which people mentioned a change in tolerance and humility, self-esteem, new knowledge). In summarizing the findings I complemented the frequencies with the rich testimonies that were used as a basis for coding the frequencies.

- At the end of May, 1998 (after collecting data on 16 of the 20 community leaders) I attended as a participant the three day course that the community leaders received. My principal reason for attending the course as a participant (I had originally planned to attend as an observer) was that I wanted to see if I experienced the same impacts that I heard repeatedly as I carried out the interviews, especially with women.

This field study confirms what IPEDEHP and USAID already knew: that community leaders are very positive about the course and that the majority return to their communities deeply committed to putting into effect what they have learned at the course.

Over the past two years these leaders have: trained thousands of additional Peruvians in human rights, democracy, and citizen participation; organized/participated in radio and television programs that promote human rights; and organized and carried out countless human rights and democracy marches and campaigns. In communities where there was no place for the populace to go to have their rights defended, community leaders trained by IPEDEHP have established Human Rights Committees. A number are in the process of establishing shelters for abused women and children. In communities where the leaders had been trained two years before, course graduates were still enthusiastically applying what they had learned in their communities.

What the study showed that neither IPEDEHP or USAID were aware of was the impact that the training program had on a number of the leaders and on their families and the fact that, when they trained others in their communities, they appeared to have the same impacts on these individuals and their families as well. There is clearly a link between these personal impacts and the commitment the leaders are showing in continuing to apply, long after the course is over, what they have learned.

Among these personal impacts are the following:

- Especially among female leaders: an increase in tolerance and self-esteem; for some women the IPEDEHP course was a turning point in their lives. A Catholic priest who participated in the training summarized the impact on women for whom the course was a turning point in their lives when he said: *"The course touches the heart. It gives them (especially women) something new in their lives. It is an opening. It puts on the table the hidden values—equality, respect, dignity, self-esteem. It is like a conversion to human rights."*
- A number of the leaders reported that, as a result of the training, they improved their communication with family members and that they were more tolerant and understanding toward them.
- Most of the community leaders put what they learned at the training course into practice defending their own rights.

- The net effect of being able to successfully apply what they learned at the training course (be it giving multiplier courses, organizing and carrying out radio and television programs and marches, forming human rights committees) was an increase in their stature as leaders in their communities.
- Of particular interest (and this came up repeatedly in the interviews) was a decrease in physical violence: a number of the women who receive training reported that they now did not permit their husbands to beat them; several volunteered that they had learned not to beat their children but instead how important it was to treat them as equals.
- These findings with the leaders (increased knowledge of rights; less physical abuse from spouses and towards children, increases in self-esteem among women) also emerged in the interviews with individuals who had received training from the leaders.

Since I had neither the time nor the resources to do a more in depth study regarding impacts at the community level, I had to limit myself to reports from leaders and others in the communities that I interviewed regarding their perceptions of changes in the community as a result of the work that the IPEDEHP trained community leaders had done in their communities. Given the importance of this theme, I highly recommend a specific study focusing on this topic.

Listed below are some impressions of community impacts based on opinions that I received from community leaders and other people I interviewed in the communities I visited:

- People more conscious of their rights.
- People know where they can go to be assisted when their rights are violated.
- More women defending their rights.
- Fewer cases of violence against women.
- Innocent people released from jail.
- Reduction in complaints among students of being poorly treated by their professors.
- Development of the ability, with success, to confront local authorities who were violating their rights.
- Establishment of good relations with local authorities, increasing possibilities for cooperation in people's defense when there are rights violations.

Regarding the last bullet, a District Attorney of a town in the jungle where the community leaders trained by IPEDEHP established a Human Rights Committee observed the following about the two community leaders: *"They play an important role. They are the linkage between people of a low level of culture and ourselves. The community leaders identify with them, they get out to their small communities. These ladies, in a totally disinterested fashion, bring the concerns of these individuals to our attention. They do not abandon unjust cases. They tell the truth. It is very helpful to have them as allies."*

CHALLENGES BEING FACED BY IPEDEHP THAT OTHER GROUPS SIMILAR TO IPEDEHP WILL FACE

Working in an area as sensitive as educating in human rights is not easy. When IPEDEHP was established, educating in human rights was seen by some sectors--within the Peruvian government, the military and civil society--as something that supported the terrorists. The terrorists saw education in human rights as threatening to their philosophy. They accused human

rights educators of being the “pillows of the government” or “agents of the American imperialists”. At that time the challenge for IPEDEHP and similar groups was to walk the thin line of defending human rights in the midst of accusations from both sides.

While there has been progress over the years, working in human rights education in Peru still engenders fear and suspicion. Added to the above are other challenges:

- Total dependency on outside sources of financing which, if this funding were to disappear, would threaten the future existence of IPEDEHP and other groups like it.
- Increasing demand for training from IPEDEHP from a variety of sectors, which IPEDEHP is not currently equipped to meet and which, if met, would take IPEDEHP away from its principal focus of providing services to poor people who are least apt to know what their rights are and how to defend them.
- The need to follow-up on/provide more in-depth information to the community leaders after they take the course and apply what they have learned in their communities. This requires financial resources and constant attention.
- More and more community leaders trained by IPEDEHP are engaging in activities that go well beyond training (such as establishing Human Rights Committees and shelters). IPEDEHP, as a training institution, is not set up (other than with training) to help them implement these activities.
- IPEDEHP needs to decide whether to continue with the low profile it has maintained to date (so as to not enter into competition with the groups that it has helped train in human rights education that are members of the Peruvian Human Rights Education Network) or increase its profile as an organization. This may be a moot point, as the more training it does, the more broadly it becomes known.
- IPEDEHP is constantly evaluating its training process and using this information to update its programs. However, like other human rights education groups worldwide, IPEDEHP is not set up, on an ongoing basis, to assess the impact of its training programs as part of its ongoing monitoring function.
- IPEDEHP has some important decisions to take about its future. Should it dedicate its efforts primarily to doing training or should it evolve toward becoming an institution that primarily designs and pilots new materials and approaches which are implemented by other institutions.

WHY SUPPORT IN PERU AND ELSEWHERE PROGRAMS THAT PROVIDE TRAINING IN HUMAN RIGHTS AND DEMOCRACY THAT APPLY STRATEGIES AND METHODOLOGIES SIMILAR TO THOSE OF IPEDEHP?

The field data show that clearly there is something happening as a result of the IPEDEHP experience that is having an impact on a number of the people who attend the course and that this, in turn, is impacting on the lives of others who they interact with after attending the course—be they family members or members of their communities. Since it is not a comparative study it does not attempt to compare IPEDEHP’s approach and methodology with those of other programs that provide training in human rights and democracy.

The question, therefore, becomes: Why support in Peru and elsewhere programs that provide training in human rights and democracy that apply strategies and methodologies similar to those of IPEDEHP?

Several answers to this question are provided below:

- ***What IPEDEHP provides is a comprehensive program of education-action which touches on the meaning of life of a number of the participants, integrating basic values (dignity, respect, equality, self-esteem) within the context of their daily lives.*** This creates, among many of the participants, a strong commitment to applying what they have learned at the IPEDEHP training program in training others and carrying out other activities in their communities. The title of the course says it well: “You Have Rights: Know Them, Promote Them, Defend Them”.
- ***The approach followed by IPEDEHP is an effective means of building democracy by strengthening social capital:*** One of the strengths of the way IPEDEHP operates is that it builds and nurtures networks of friendship, trust and commitment among and between individuals as well as among and between organizations. IPEDEHP “gives” (by sharing its training materials and methodologies with individuals and organizations in these networks) and IPEDEHP “receives” (support from members of these networks in identifying community leaders and accompanying them after they return from the IPEDEHP training course). It is these networks of trust that are identified by Robert Putnam (“*Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*”) and Francis Fukuyama (“*Trust: The Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity*”) as being fundamental to building social capital, which in turn is a critical basis for building democracies.
- ***IPEDEHP’s methodology is particularly valuable in societies that have been through or are going through major conflict.*** IPEDEHP incorporates a therapeutic element into its training. The interactive activities (games, dynamics, role plays) permit participants to relive the impact of violence on themselves, their families and their communities. The atmosphere created in the course also permits participants to speak openly about the impacts of violence that is currently taking place in their communities. In addition (as mentioned above), the IPEDEHP methodology helps to rebuild trust networks that have often been severely damaged as a result of violence.
- ***IPEDEHP’s methodology is also critical in a society such as Peru where the government violates the rights of citizens through its legal system.*** IPEDEHP training encourages reflection. It encourages participants to adopt a critical attitude and, in doing so, to express what they think. This is particularly critical in the Peru of today where human rights violations continue but on a more subtle plane. The government has passed a number of laws and legislation which compromise the rights of Peruvian citizens without going through an open consultation process. As I was told by a prominent political scientist in Peru, it is precisely the type of training that organizations like IPEDEHP provide that is key for today’s context. Through the training people are educated on what their rights are. This training also gives them the tools they need to demand that their rights be taken into consideration.
- ***IPEDEHP’s approach provides an excellent example of paving the way for reform by starting at the bases.*** Experience is showing that reform is apt to be more lasting if it starts at the bases rather than being imposed from above. A particular strength of the way IPEDEHP works is that it helps forge linkages between PVOs and community groups and the state. Workshop participants include community leaders, representatives of NGOs, representatives of municipalities and other state entities located in the zone where the training is being offered. Little by little a fabric is being woven in Peru composed of people

with the same ideals who are organizing to claim their rights—be they from the police, the military, municipal authorities, or the national government.

- ***Finally, the type of training/education that IPEDEHP offers is the vital link between lack of knowledge of one's rights and one's ability to defend one's rights.*** Through the training provided by institutions such as IPEDEHP, people become empowered. They learn what their rights are and where to go when they are violated. They not only replicate the training course they received but they go the next step: forming human rights committees, defending their own rights, giving people advice on how to defend their rights, promoting rights through the mass media.

In the words of the legal advisor in one of the Vicarages in Puno: *“Legal defense is a consequence of the education in human rights that a person has received. If the education level is low, people have low self-esteem and don't go to institutions for help. Education is fundamental. It permits people to help us in defending their rights. If people didn't know their rights and that we exist we couldn't work.”*

MORE QUESTIONS AWAITING ANSWERS

This study began with questions and it finished with questions. Unanswered questions for IPEDEHP and other groups that are working in human rights education or wish to do so emerge from several of the challenges posed in Chapter VIII. Other unanswered questions emerge from the field study (posed in Chapter X) and invite further field research.

CHAPTER I

OPENING

1989: ONE OF THE TRAINING COURSES THAT IPEDEHP CARRIED OUT IN THE WORST MOMENTS OF POLITICAL VIOLENCE IN A TOWN TWO HOURS FROM PUNO, PERU.

It is 1989. The place is Huancané, department of Puno, Perú. Two trainers from the Instituto Peruano de Educación en Derechos Humanos y la Paz (Peruvian Institute for Education in Human Rights and Peace—IPEDEHP) have been invited by the Catholic Regional Education Office in Puno to give a workshop on human rights to teachers in a town that is approximately two hours by car from Puno. They arrive at the Juliaca airport and disembark from the airplane. They are greeted by two people with a sign that says “human rights”. The priest advises them that what they are planning to do is very risky. This is a dangerous moment to travel into the country side to provide training, especially in human rights.

The trainers, who have already analyzed the situation with the rest of their team in Lima, reassess the situation. Should they should return to Lima and cancel the workshop or should they, since they have already made it to Puno and the teachers are waiting for them with high expectations, proceed as planned, even knowing the risks? They decide to comply with their commitment to the teachers and take the risk.

After a sleepless night in Puno the trainers leave the next day for Huancané. Both are seated in the back seat of the car. They are accompanied by two people. Each has a pistol as an “instrument of protection”.

1998: MEETING OF TEACHER PROMOTERS IN CAJAMARCA, PERU

It is May of 1998, nine years later. Three IPEDEHP trainers travel to Cajamarca to give a course on “Human Rights, Democracy, and Citizen Participation” to a group of community leaders. They take advantage of their visit to Cajamarca to meet with a group of primary and secondary teachers who in 1986, by invitation of the Catholic Education Office of the Diocese of Cajamarca (ODEC), received the first training course in human rights provided by IPEDEHP. Since the course, and with the permanent follow-up of IPEDEHP, these persons became teacher promoters. Over the years they have trained many other teachers in the zone in human rights and democracy. The meeting takes place at MANTHOC, an NGO that assists child workers.

There is an atmosphere of warmth, friendship, and happiness. It is evident that for this group it is a great honor to meet this particular evening with one of the trainers who, in 1986, delivered the first training course to them.

The teacher promoters begin the meeting by singing the Song to Liberty which appears in the first page of this case study. This was the song they sang at IPEDEHP’s first training course which took place in Cajamarca in 1986 and which has become a symbol of IPEDEHP’s and their work in human rights education. It is a moment of a great deal of emotion and memories. They remember this first course and their reactions. They remember the times of violence and, in particular, the activities of Peru, Life and Peace—a civic movement created to protest and do something to counteract the violence that was gripping Peru.

Afterwards the teacher promoters put a poster on the wall (entitled “Weaving Our Rights in Cajamarca”) that they had prepared for a regional meeting of the Peruvian Network for Education in Human Rights Education and Peace. Listed on the poster are the activities they have carried out over the past year, among them:

- Curricular program in human rights for pre-primary and primary students.
- Consciousness raising sessions for professors.
- Workshop on conflict in the classroom.
- Ongoing short presentations and radio programs on human rights.
- A course on mental health.
- Activities to support the establishment of the Human Rights Ombudsman’s office in Cajamarca.
- A round table to establish Cajamarca’s Ombudsman’s Office for Women and Children (DEMUNA).
- Week focusing on children’s rights.
- Festival of the song for peace.
- Artistic and literary festival to support those who suffered loss due to the phenomenon of El Niño in Cajamarca.

Since I was there as an observer, I took advantage of the reunion to ask those present if their relationship with IPEDEHP had a personal impact on them. Their responses speak for themselves: ⁴

“One has a sense that one opts for a way of living, for a feeling. When one puts one’s self out to help others, one feels useful. It’s another way of living. One continues with one’s preparation. It is a challenge, a home, a sacrifice. It generates uncertainty but it is worth it.”

“To speak of human rights is to relive one’s upbringing within one’s family. I returned to my land and I had the opportunity, which fell out of the sky, to belong to a group. I feel the poverty, the lack of everything, the helplessness. Human rights compensate, they give satisfaction. I sense that I have lived little but that I have served a great deal. The training course I received from IPEDEHP was a turning point in my life. You are in a place to serve others.”

“We really like the methodology used in the IPEDEHP courses. We entered little by little. The courses pull you in. Human rights help us to be more sensitized. There is dynamism, friendship. It helps us to grow. We need to be sensitized in order to work with our students. Our students now trust us more.”

These testimonies, plus the anecdote in Puno, present some interesting food for thought:

- What is this institution that is called IPEDEHP?
- What is it about IPEDEHP that is producing testimonies such as these and which motivate people to confront danger in order to give a training course?
- When and how was IPEDEHP born and under what circumstances?
- What has IPEDEHP accomplished in its 13 years of existence?

⁴ Due to space limitations I am reporting only three out of the ten responses. All were quite similar in that they showed a great deal of emotion and personal impact.

- How has IPEDEHP adapted to changing times in Peru?
- What has been the impact of the training that IPEDEHP provides: on the people IPEDEHP trains, their families, and the people they, in turn, train in their respective communities?
- What can be learned from this experience that would be useful for other contexts?

This case study attempts to answer these questions.

CHAPTER II

FOCUS AND STRUCTURE OF THE STUDY

This study focuses on the Peruvian Institute for Education in Human Rights and Peace (IPEDEHP), the circumstances that motivated its establishment in 1985, its evolution to date, and the way it is seen within and outside of Peru. Its specific focus is on IPEDEHP's training program for community leaders in human rights, democracy, and citizen participation that began in 1996. It attempts to describe the training process and, through a field study, explore the impact that this program has had on the community leaders themselves, their families and people that they trained or otherwise assisted when they returned to their communities. To the extent possible, it attempts to explore the broader impacts on the communities.

This study is organized into ten chapters.

- Chapter III describes the methodology used to carry out the study which includes interviews within and outside of Peru and a field study to assess the impact of the program on 20 communities leaders, their families and people that they trained or otherwise assisted.
- Chapter IV sets the context. It provides a short description of the circumstances under which IPEDEHP was born in 1985: the violence of the 1980s of the Shining Path, the MRTA, the narco-traffickers and the military. It also describes efforts to counteract this violence on the part of civil society, individually and through the creation of networks of individuals and groups.
- Chapter IV takes a look at IPEDEHP from within (its structure, its objectives, its evolution) and from without (how it is seen by individuals and organizations involved in the human rights movement within and outside of Peru).
- Chapter VI describes in detail the training program for community leaders in human rights, democracy and citizen participation which is the focus of this study.
- Chapter VII provides the results of a field study carried out in three regions of Peru: Arequipa (a zone that was hardly affected by the violence), Puno (a zone affected by the violence of the terrorists and efforts to counteract the terrorists), and San Martin and Pucallpa (zones affected by the violence of the terrorists, the narco-traffickers, and efforts to counteract both types of violence.) The interviews focus on the impacts of IPEDEHP's training program for community leaders described in Chapter VI on the community leaders themselves, their families, and others that the community leaders have trained or otherwise assisted—100 interviews in total of which 20 are with the community leaders.
- Chapter VIII summarizes the lessons learned from the IPEDEHP experience that are relevant for other groups working in human rights education. It is divided into two sections: (1) strategies that IPEDEHP has successfully applied which can be adapted for use in other contexts; and (2) challenges that IPEDEHP has faced and continues to face and which other groups that want to do something similar may also face. Accompanying a number of the challenges are as yet unanswered questions for IPEDEHP and other groups that are either already carrying out programs similar to IPEDEHP's or who would like to adopt a strategy similar to that used by IPEDEHP.

- Departing from the data that come out of this study, Chapter IX attempts to answer the question: Why support in Peru and in other countries training programs in human rights and education that use methodologies similar to those of IPEDEHP?
- Chapter X concludes by presenting questions for further research. It also summarizes the comments of those who reviewed this document in draft and describes how these comments were incorporated into this final report.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY USED TO CARRY OUT THE CASE STUDY ⁵

The methodology used to carry out the field study has a strong qualitative focus. Although it by no means discards the use of quantitative data, a qualitative methodology has been used to capture information as a means of complementing existing quantitative data. This has been done for two reasons:

- ***Given that they come from diverse socio-economic levels and backgrounds—no two community leaders will apply what they learned at the training course in exactly the same way.*** In order to be able to capture the rich information on what they did with their training and what others learned from them, I felt that it was necessary to carry out open-ended interviews with each community leader, his/her family, and individuals in the community influenced by the community leader. In this way, I was able to pick up on leads identified in one interview ⁶ and follow up/confirm them in subsequent interviews ⁷
- ***It is difficult, with only quantitative data, to assess the full impact of a training program such as that provided by IPEDEHP, which has a strong affective focus, on the community leader, his/her family and individuals influenced by the community leader.*** The strength of quantitative techniques is that they make it possible, with a good level of precision, to obtain descriptive data. However, to obtain data of a more “personal” nature—as for example the impact of the program on the person him/herself—it is necessary to use more open ended and qualitative techniques that permit the person interviewed to express his/her perspectives and thoughts in a more open fashion.

The information for this study was collected between the months of January and November, 1998. During this period I took advantage of four trips to Peru to:

- ***Become acquainted with IPEDEHP’s internal operations:*** through individual interviews with IPEDEHP staff, observation of their daily activities, review of IPEDEHP’s files. ⁸

⁵ Due to limitations in time it was not possible to become acquainted in detail with all the programs IPEDEHP has carried out since it began in 1985. The work of IPEDEHP that is most known is its work with the formal education system over its 13 years of existence which has benefited over 13,000 pre-primary, primary and secondary teachers. It would be worthwhile, if the opportunity were to be presented, to carry out a more in depth study of IPEDEHP’s work in the area of formal education and its impact on teachers, students, and parents. It would also be worthwhile to do a more in-depth study of the impact of the Peruvian Network for Education in Human Rights and Peace given the collaboration that has taken place between IPEDEHP and this network.

⁶ For example, identify that when the community leader returned from the training he/she played the human right game with his/her children; and that, as a result, one child then went to school and started promoting human rights with his/her classmates.

⁷ In the above case, interviewing the child to see what he/she thought of the game, what he/she did with classmates at school after playing the game to promote human rights, and going to the school to interview the child’s teacher and classmates to confirm that the child did, in fact, promote human rights in his/her classroom.

⁸ This was a continuous effort that I carried out during the course of my four visits to Peru.

- ***Get a sense of IPEDEHP's external image.*** through semi-structured interviews with 45 people within and outside of Peru, among them: representatives of the human rights community in Peru, from the NGO community, the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Justice, the National Congress, the Human Rights Ombudsman's Office, mass media, donors in and outside of Peru, and representatives of the human rights network of the Latin American Council on Adult Education (CEAAL).⁹
- ***Attend, in February of 1988, as an observer, IPEDEHP's first annual meeting of community leaders that took place in Lima.*** This was my first exposure to the IPEDEHP community leaders program. I took advantage of meals, coffee breaks and excursions during the four day meeting to carry out individual and focus group interviews with the leaders in order to explore: their reactions to the training they had received from IPEDEHP, what they had done with the training, and the impact of the training on them. The information I gathered at this meeting was very helpful in designing the protocol I used to carry out the actual field study.
- ***Attend, in late May of 1998, as a participant, one of IPEDEHP's training courses for community leaders that took place in Cajamarca.*** The title of this three day course was: "*You Have Rights: Know Them, Promote Them, Defend Them*". I was originally planning to attend as an observer, as I had done at annual meeting in February. However, as a result of the data I obtained from the field study (below), I decided it would be much more productive to attend as a full-fledged participant.
- ***Carry out during the first three weeks of May of 1998 and then in September of 1998, in four departments of Peru¹⁰, a field study to assess the impact of the training on 20 community leaders, their families and people they had influenced after having received the training from IPEDEHP:*** Each case consisted of interviews with: the community leader, members of his/her family, and 3-4 individuals from the community with whom the community leader had contact after the training. I interviewed a total of approximately 100 people. I used, in an iterative fashion,¹¹ open ended interviews to obtain information on the following themes:

⁹ This was also a continuous process. I took advantage of my time in Lima during each of my visits to Peru to interview individuals who were available at the time of my visit. A list of the people I interviewed may be found in Annex B.

¹⁰ Arequipa, in the mountains, is a city of 500,000 inhabitants that was not affected by terrorism. Puno, also in the mountains, is a city of 100,000. I also interviewed community leaders in a small town of 5,000 inhabitants two hours from Puno near the border with Bolivia. Both were affected by the terrorism of the Shining Path and the response of the military. I also visited various communities with populations between 5,000 and 100,000 in the Departments of San Martin and Pucallpa in the jungle that were affected by the violence of the MRTA, the narco-traffickers, and the military.

¹¹ I carried out the data collection in two phases. I visited Arequipa, Puno and San Martin in May. When I returned to Peru in September I visited a fourth location, Pucallpa. I took advantage of the second round of interviews in Pucallpa to explore in more depth some of the themes that surfaced after analyzing the data from the first three locations and having attended the IPEDEHP training course for community leaders in the end of May.

- *How the training provided by IPEDEHP was perceived by the community leader.*
 - *What the community leader did with the training he/she received from IPEDEHP upon returning to his/her community*
 - *Whether there was an impact on the community leader—on his/her self-image, on the way he/she saw/treated others.*
 - *Whether there were impacts on the families of the community leaders and what family members learned from the community leader.*
 - *Changes in behavior of the community leaders with their families, upon returning from training, as perceived by the community leaders and their families.*
 - *Impacts on the community in general.*
- ***Submit, at the end of October of 1998, a draft of the case study to several experts in the area of human rights and human rights education within and outside of Peru for their review.*** I received comments on the draft from a total of 31 persons -- 5 community leaders that participated in the study, 18 people in Lima that work in human rights and related areas, and 8 people outside of Peru. In November I traveled to Lima in order to meet with people (individually and in group) to get their feedback on the study.

COMMENTS ON THE METHODOLOGY USED TO COLLECT AND ANALYZE THE FIELD DATA

The selection of the sample (carried out by myself without any influence from IPEDEHP) was based on three criteria—gender (women, men), region of Peru (highlands, jungle, places affected by terrorism, not affected by terrorism), and size of community where the leaders live (large city with a population of 500,000, cities of 100,000, cities of 30,000-60,000 inhabitants, towns of between 5,000 and 8,000 inhabitants). I also obtained data on age, educational level, and occupation from each community leader.

The analysis of the results was carried out with the specific objective of studying phenomena related to the training that emerged through the 20 cases. The analysis had two principal foci: (1) considering each community leader as a unit of analysis, identify what happened in his/her life and the lives of people around the leader after the training; (2) within this analysis try to identify if there were any elements in common between the cases—be they changes in knowledge, behavior, or in their own views of themselves.

Upon completing the first phase of the field study in May, I established folders in my computer, each corresponding to one of the cases. I included in each folder all the testimonies I was able to obtain as a result of interviewing the individual, his/her family members and others in the community.¹² As a next step, I established for each interview topic¹³ a special document into which I copied relevant information from the testimonies that I received for each case.

In carrying out the analysis I looked for common themes appearing in the testimonies related to each topic and did a frequency count for each. I began the analysis breaking the data out by variable (gender, location, age, etc.) in order to see if there were any differences within each

¹² The case materials found in Annex A are drawn directly from three of these folders.

¹³ For example: what the community leader through of the training, how he/she applied what was learned at the training once back in the community, the impact on themselves, what they did with their families.

variable (for example between men and women). Where I did not find differences I used the total sample as the basis for doing a frequency count.

Chapter VII of this report summarizes what I found as a result of this analysis. In reporting on most of the themes I begin with a summary of frequencies (either for the total sample or broken out if there were differences within variables). For the remainder of the text I draw from the testimonies that served as a basis for tabulating the frequencies for each theme.

It is possible that some of the frequencies that appear in the report are under-estimated. Most of the data were obtained using open ended interviews in which I did not ask specific questions but rather focused on broader themes. During the latter portion of the interviewing, once I had a better sense of what to look for, I made more frequent use of probing in order to explore topics of specific interest.

TWO CLARIFICATIONS

I would like to emphasize that this was a case study and not a programmatic evaluation of IPEDEHP's program for community leaders. The intent of the study was to explore the impact that a program of this type can have on the community leaders themselves, their family members and others who they influence after returning from the IPEDEHP training. It was for this reason that I selected community leaders trained by IPEDEHP who had, after having been trained, applied what they learned in their communities. If I had carried out a programmatic evaluation I would have selected a representative sample of community leaders, including within it individuals who received the IPEDEHP training but did not put into practice what they learned once they returned to their communities. I would also have spent more time becoming acquainted with IPEDEHP's management of the community leaders program financed by USAID.

I would also like to clarify that I entered this study in the capacity of a psychologist/emerging applied anthropologist eager to learn from the individuals I interviewed and without any preconceived ideas or hypotheses regarding what I would encounter. While I have ample background in the field of applied research and evaluation, my knowledge of the human rights arena in general, and human rights education in particular, was quite limited when I began the study.

FIELD STUDY LIMITATIONS

The field study should be considered as a pilot. This was my first time applying this specific methodology. I also had, for personal reasons, limited time available to do the field work. The ideal, with sufficient time and adequate resources, would be to use this study as a point of departure for carrying out a more in depth field study.

- In the case of 15 community leaders, it was possible to interview one or more family members as well as people that they had influenced in their communities upon returning from training. Various factors ¹⁴ made it impossible to carry out “complete” interviews with the other 5 community leaders.
- The majority of the data that focus on impact on the community in general come from the community leaders themselves along with the individuals that they in turn assisted. In order to conduct a study of the impact of this program at the community level it would have been necessary to stay in each community for a more extended period of time to carry out a more in depth study that would have also included the collection of quantitative data.
- With a few exceptions ¹⁵, it was not possible to observe the community leaders applying what they had learned once in their communities. Instead, I received the testimonies of individuals who had been trained by the community leaders or otherwise benefited from their activities. The community leaders, through their own testimonies, also provided their perceptions of what they did and how effective they felt they had been.
- It is not possible to attribute all the changes reported in Chapter VII to the training provided by IPEDEHP. Half of the community leaders trained by IPEDEHP already had some prior knowledge of human rights and democracy. This could have contributed to some of the changes that the leaders attributed to having participated in the IPEDEHP training program.

¹⁴ Not having been able to make arrangements to do the interviews with sufficient advanced notice in some communities, the fact that, in some cases, my visit was over a weekend which, as it turned out, was a time when it was not possible to reach a number of the people I would have ordinarily wanted to have interviewed because they were outside of their homes.

¹⁵ The exceptions are as follows: I was able to observe one community leader deliver a radio program that had within it a human rights component. I was also able to observe several television programs given by another community leader in which he inserted human rights elements into the program. Finally, I was able to observe one community leader delivering, as part of a broader training program, a talk on human rights.

CHAPTER IV

EVOLUTION OF THE CONTEXT WITHIN WHICH IPEDEHP HAS OPERATED BETWEEN 1985 AND THE PRESENT

The Peruvian Institute for Education in Human Rights and Peace was born in 1985 at a time in which Peru, in addition to experiencing its most serious economic crisis of the century, was also confronted by serious political violence.

Cynthia McClintock, who follows closely what has been happening in Peru,¹⁶ pointed out that in the 1980s Peru was suffering an economic decline that had no comparison with any other country in Latin America. In 1989 the minimum wage purchased 23% of what it could purchase in 1980, affecting in particular the poorest people in Peru—people living in urban marginal areas in the cities and in the country side. In 1990 the government implemented a series of structural adjustment policies along with steps to modernize the state to address the serious economic crisis. While inflation went down and exports increased, statistics show that six years later, in 1996, poverty remained high. Over 50% of Peru's population were classified as poor and approximately 4.5 million of Peru's 22 million citizens were in conditions of critical poverty.¹⁷

One of the impacts of the economic crisis of the 1980s and the political violence was the weakening of Peru's organized social movement and the erosion of existing democratic institutions in Peru which were already fragile. This was manifested by: insufficient salaries, corruption among government functionaries, weakening of labor unions, political parties and civil society institutions, an increase in the size of the informal sector, and a demoralized population. This situation has continued to worsen.

Peru, during different moments in its history, has been confronted by violence. However, the violence that took place during the 1980s and the early 1990s had special characteristics. The terrorist actions of the Shining Path and the MRTA--in conjunction with the brutal response of the state through its armed forces--left more than 25,000 dead, 6,000 people who disappeared, thousands of innocent people in prison, and hundreds of thousands of displaced people most of whom were defenseless. Terror, lack of trust, and insecurity set in. Initial efforts on the part of civic movements, civil society institutions, human rights movements and church groups were directed toward mobilizing "the capacity of indignation on the part of Peru's population" to search for peaceful alternatives.

Peruvian civil society was very active during these years of political violence and the economic crisis. The poor put into practice survival strategies to deal with hunger: among them soup kitchens, women's clubs, and glass of milk programs. In the mid 1980s a group of Peruvian NGOs with a clear social projection, who were concerned with injustice and poverty and had a strong focus on social and economic rights, began to orient their efforts toward the defense of civil and political rights, such as the right to life and physical integrity.

These were also the years in which new organizations were founded to promote human rights--the Legal Defense Institute (IDL), the Center for Study and Action to Promote Peace (CEAPAZ), and the Peruvian Institute for Education in Human Rights and Peace (IPEDEHP). When they

¹⁶ McClintock, Cynthia. *Peru's Fujimori: A Caudillo Derails Democracy*. Current History, March, 1993.

¹⁷ Oficina de Iniciativas Democráticas (Office of Democratic Initiatives). *Peru: Proceso Democrático 1992-1997*, USAID/Peru, 1998.

were first founded these organizations worked in an isolated fashion. However, as the violence increased, they began to form support networks. In 1985 the Peruvian National Human Rights Coordinator was established as a “mechanism for coordinating the human rights organizations in the country”. It currently has more than 50 institutions under its umbrella. In 1986 the Peruvian Network for Education in Human Rights and Peace, today composed of more than 70 groups in Peru, was established. It is known as the “educational arm” of the National Human Rights Coordinator.

During these years, the civic movement “Perú, Life, and Peace” was established with the slogan *“If we unite forces, if we act with good will, and if we act now, there is reason for hope”*. Peru, Life and Peace united thousands of individuals from throughout Peru who wanted to make a statement against violence and death. Peru, Life, and Peace carried out a large number of activities--among them educational talks, musical festivals, debate groups, marches. They sought to, and in large part were successful in, reducing the paralysis and fear that spread throughout Peruvian society.

Thanks to the people of Peru and its organizations in the cities and the country side, the Shining Path and the MRTA saw themselves progressively cornered. Their efforts, in conjunction with the effective strategy of DINCOTE (the anti-terrorist unit of the national police), brought strong blows to terrorism. These efforts culminated, in September of 1992, in the capture of Abimael Guzmán (the maximum leader of the Shining Path) and a large number of his lieutenants and, with it, the destruction of terrorism in Peru.

The Peruvian population began to breathe a different air. Serious human rights abuses (such as the brutal murder of innocent citizens and disappearances) began to decline. Peru was provided with an excellent opportunity to strengthen democracy and achieve social and economic stability.

However, the Peruvian government has not taken full advantage of this opportunity. Since 1992 serious human rights violations have continued in a number of areas. A report of the United States Department of State on the human rights situation in Peru¹⁸ indicates that in 1997: the Peruvian security forces were responsible for tortures and beatings; conditions in the jails remained very harsh; arbitrary detentions of the Peruvian population continued; and the Peruvian government infringed on the rights of privacy and freedom of press of the Peruvian population. Over this period the powers of the state--judicial, electoral, and legislative--were subordinated to the executive. A number of independent judges were removed from their jobs.

Today, in some parts of Peru, there are still columns of the Shining Path and the MRTA. The Peruvian population still experiences fear, especially toward the military who, according to some interviews I carried out, continue to commit abuses against the population. Peruvian institutions are still weak and political parties lack credibility. Peruvian society, until now, has not been able to cure the wounds left by the political violence.

It is, however, important to recognize the signs of progress in Peru during the last few years. Among them, one can point to improvements in the economic situation (significant reduction in inflation, growth of the GNP and external investment); and a clear reduction in the worst violations of human rights such as forced disappearances of citizens, extra-judicial proceedings; the creation by Congress of the Office of the Human Rights Ombudsman; the creation of an ad-

¹⁸ U.S. Department of State. *“Peru Country Report on Human Rights Practices for 1997”*.

hoc Commission to liberate innocent people unjustly incarcerated under suspicion of terrorism, and modifications to the anti-terrorist legislation.

It is important to highlight that these are achievements of the Peruvian populace. However, it is also important to point to the fundamental role of the human rights movement in addressing human rights violations.

Today, in contrast to prior years, the theme of human rights has been legitimized and the movement that supports human rights has gained credibility, trust, recognition, and importance in Peru and internationally.

CHAPTER V

IPEDEHP SEEN FROM WITHIN AND WITHOUT

The majority of the individuals who are currently members of the IPEDEHP staff met when the Peruvian Chapter of Amnesty International lead an initiative to develop human rights education activities in Peru. Those who became part of IPEDEHP come from backgrounds of having worked in the formal education sector and in popular education during the 1970s. All had a clear option for serving Peru's poor. From the start, they were convinced that education played a key role in legitimizing human rights and democracy in Peru.

There were four reasons for IPEDEHP's establishment:

- (1) Consciousness that lack of knowledge of one's rights make people more vulnerable to abuse and exploitation. Educating people in their rights can help them to become active defenders of their rights.
- (2) One of the principal strategies of the terrorist groups for extending their violent philosophy was to infiltrate Peruvian schools. Teachers and young people were key subjects of their teachings. It was, therefore, critical to work with the same people toward whom they were projecting their teachings if these teachings were to be counter acted.
- (3) The tremendous multiplier effect of working with teachers. Teachers are present throughout Peru and in direct contact with children, young people, and parents.
- (4) Given their experience as educators, those who founded IPEDEHP had a greater possibility of impacting on the education system.

I would like to highlight the testimonies of two people who were very important in the history of IPEDEHP--Hans Jurgen Brandt, a German citizen who was the director of the Friedrich Naumann Foundation in Peru and who made possible some of the first donations to IPEDEHP in 1987 that were used to train teachers in human rights and democracy; and Jorge Osorio, current President of the Latin American Counsel for Adult Education (CEAAL), who at that time was in charge of CEAAL's Network for Education in Human Rights and Peace and who has accompanied IPEDEHP over the years.

IPEDEHP - TWO REMEMBRANCES

Hans Jurgen Brandt, former director of the Friedrich Naumann Foundation in Peru.

"I worked with IPEDEHP since the mid 1980s until the end of 1988. Since I was trained as a judge, I had a specialty in human rights and legal services projects.

During this time when IPEDEHP was formed they presented a very interesting proposal to us designed to have a multiplier effect and that got to the most important areas of Peru, working through teachers. The objective was to train teachers in a program focusing on human rights. However, their strategy was not to create courses specifically oriented toward teaching human rights that were added to the curriculum. Instead, they decided to adopt a strategy of introducing human rights issues within all of the subject matter in the curriculum. Given the problems with the Shining Path and the MRTA there was a tremendous need for education in human rights in Peru.

Given their extensive experience as educators, the members of IPEDEHP had the ability to understand the specific problems faced by teachers in Peru. They had the capacity to facilitate groups and implement innovative methodologies with the objective of motivating teachers to participate. The seminar participants worked in groups, presenting the results of their group work to the plenary. They played educational games and they evaluated the seminars. For the majority of the teachers the methodology they learned from IPEDEHP was completely new. They learned how to apply this methodology in their daily work in their schools."

Jorge Osorio, President of the Latin American Council for Adult Education (CEAAL).

"I met the group that originally founded IPEDEHP in 1986. At that time I was the coordinator of CEAAL's Human Rights Education Network. I travelled to Peru to promote the Network and I attended events where we shared out experiences. When I first met IPEDEHP they had been able to launch a human rights education program for teachers.

During that period the violence in Peru was at its peak. The Shining Path had begun to insert itself within urban areas. In the world of the PVOs and social movements there were discussions of how to confront the political debate and the work of the Shining Path in rural and urban communities. The objective of the work carried out in the human rights arena was to mobilize the population, through popular gatherings, to repudiate the violence.

At this moment (1986) the work of IPEDEHP was significant within CEAAL's human rights network. I was impressed with their methodology. It was attractive and it had a strong conceptual base. Their policy was to establish, among teachers, the capacity to identify human rights problems.

IPEDEHP took the lead in forming a human rights education network in Peru that met at least once a year. I was able to attend their meetings. At the beginning they were meetings to draw up maps of the key human rights problems, share experience in human rights and human rights education, and train human rights educators in conceptual issues related to the judicial and educational aspects of human rights."

IPEDEHP'S CHARACTERISTICS AND ITS OPERATIONS

IPEDEHP is made up of a small group of seven professionals and five support staff. Most of the professionals have been associated with IPEDEHP from its establishment; first as volunteers and, as IPEDEHP received financing for its activities, progressively as paid employees. To date all of IPEDEHP's financing has come from external sources. During its 13 years of existence it has received funding from 10 donors¹⁹, most located in Europe. Several of these donors have financed IPEDEHP's programs on a consecutive basis over a number of years. Although this speaks well of IPEDEHP, this dependency on external financing is the largest challenge the organization faces.

There is little distinction between IPEDEHP's operating staff and its board. IPEDEHP's Assembly is made up of all the professionals who belong to IPEDEHP plus two individuals that no longer work with the institution. Every two years the Assembly elects an oversight committee composed of three people one of whom acts as President of the institution.

IPEDEHP operates in a house in a semi residential/commercial zone of Lima. Due to economic limitations, none of the professionals have their own office, although each has his/her own desk. Each room has three or four desks. IPEDEHP staff share computers.

The first impression one has, upon entering their local, is activity. All of the space—the conference room, the kitchen, the porch—are full of people in meetings, producing copies, preparing materials for seminars. What one most notices is the atmosphere of caring and respect that exist among IPEDEHP's staff. Every day when they come to work they give each other hugs, including the driver. It is clear that they like working together.

In the words of one of IPEDEHP's founders:

"IPEDEHP offered me a space to do what I want to do and develop my creativity. We like what we are doing. We get along well."

Another of IPEDEHP's founders adds:

"We are a team that complement one another. IPEDEHP does not depend on one person. We are a group that is committed to what we are doing. We are constantly criticizing our work. Democracy is a reality. We are open to having frank discussions. No one has the last word."

Very clear, from conversations with IPEDEHP staff, is that they are a group with a clear vision. They are also clear on their objectives and have common values. While small and informal in their use of physical space, each person is also clear on his/her role. Together this contributes to IPEDEHP's effective operations.

IPEDEHP'S EVOLUTION

During the early years, and until the violence began to decline in 1994, IPEDEHP's staff—as was the case with all people who worked in the area of human rights education—had to take

¹⁹ BILANCE, Misereor, European Union, Friedrich Naumann Foundation, Diakonia of Sweden, Hands United of Spain, USAID, Save the Children, Radda Barnen, Canadian Embassy.

many precautions. They did not travel to Ayacucho or other zones highly affected by the violence in order to carry out their training programs. They went to other zones, such as Puno and Cajamarca, where the Shining Path had presence but where the risks weren't as direct. During the most difficult moments, they took precautions in their Lima office to avoid receiving and opening letter bombs. Some of their members varied their routes in traveling to the office.

In some of their training courses they had members of the Shining Path or the Intelligence Service as infiltrators. IPEDEHP's policy, when this occurred, was to permit these individuals to stay. When they asked provocative questions, the IPEDEHP trainer answered their questions directly. As occurred with other organizations during this period, some of the members of IPEDEHP received direct threats. There were never, however, any attempts against any of their lives.

During their first ten years, IPEDEHP staff were dedicated almost exclusively to the education of teachers, training more than 13,000 teachers in human rights and democracy. In addition, 250 teacher promoters trained by IPEDEHP have trained thousands more teachers.

Over this period, and thanks to an ongoing practice of evaluations and self-criticism, IPEDEHP has managed to prepare a human rights and democracy curriculum. They have also developed a program for integrating human rights and democracy throughout the whole school structure. IPEDEHP's methodology for educating in human rights and democracy is directed toward pre-primary, primary, and secondary teachers as well as teachers and students in the Superior Pedagogical Institutes.

Since its inception IPEDEHP has maintained four elements of its strategy as constants:

- ***The conviction that it is fundamental, if one is training in human rights, to value the person and his/her dignity as a human being.*** The themes of respect, dignity, equality, and self-esteem permeate all of its publications and the training programs it has carried out since it began operations in 1985.
- ***The conviction that, in order to value one's self and value others, it is important to establish contact with one's own feelings, aspirations, and fears.*** The games and dynamics, which have been perfected over the years, put a great deal of emphasis on the affective. During the training courses there are many opportunities to return to memories of one's childhood, to share how one felt when confronted with personal experiences of violence or abuse.
- ***The conviction that working in human rights has to be done in collaboration with others because the practice of human rights has to do with collective destinies.*** To be effective in this sensitive area it is indispensable to affiliate one's self with others, be it delivering training programs in human rights in one's communities or organizing to carry out activities at the community level in defense of human rights.

IPEDEHP'S policy has been not to impose its programs and methodologies on others. Instead it accepts invitations from NGOs, religious groups, the director and teachers of a given school, a Superior Pedagogical Institute, a departmental or regional office of the Ministry of Education that is working with teachers. In addition, IPEDEHP has a policy of

sharing everything with everyone. Its materials and methodologies are available to anyone that asks for them.

- ***The need to become involved in existing social movements and, in so doing, help to build a more solid social fabric among other civil society institutions.*** In the words of one of IPEDEHP's founders: "We have always linked up with others at the local level. We give and we receive, parting from the reality and the needs of the situation we are in. We work in coordination with local institutions. We never work alone. Our interest is not in strengthening ourselves. Instead we strive to strengthen local groups and social movements. We can count on the enthusiastic collaboration of more than 250 teacher promoters and on the permanent coordination of more than 70 institutions that belong to the Peruvian Network for Education in Human Rights and Peace."

Other elements of IPEDEHP's strategy have evolved over time, permitting IPEDEHP—among others—to reflect its permanent dialogue with Peruvian reality within its approach to training in human rights and democracy:

- ***Enriching a very practical methodology.*** What the participant brings to the training serves as the point of departure for the learning that takes place in the training course. This is enriched with the input of other classmates. In its early years IPEDEHP focused on consciousness raising among teachers as to what their rights were and how to teach these rights to their students. Today, IPEDEHP's approach to training in human rights consists of introducing a philosophy and mechanisms for integrating the themes of human rights and democracy into all aspects of the school's operations.
- ***Emphasis on new areas of emphasis and on more specificity.*** In its early years, due to Peru's situation, the key themes in human rights training were violence, the right to life, no to torture. Now IPEDEHP's training focuses on themes related to social and cultural rights such as equality, respect for differences, and self-esteem. In addition, IPEDEHP began by doing generic training in human rights. Today IPEDEHP has the capacity to provide training on more specific themes such as: self-esteem, conflict resolution, organizing a democratic school environment, evaluating a democratic school, and discipline in the classroom.
- ***The conviction that, to be effective, one must constantly accompany the trainees.*** In its early years IPEDEHP delivered a training course and left. Today most programs have a strong component that focuses on follow-up after the course. Responsibility for follow up may rest with IPEDEHP directly and/or the local counterpart with which it works.
- ***The conviction that all the personnel in the school, and not only the teachers, have to be involved in the change.*** At the beginning the tendency was to work directly with groups of teachers. Today IPEDEHP is convinced that the most effective way to motivate change in schools is through agreements with the schools that permit IPEDEHP to work with the director and all staff at the school (including administrative and service personnel) both in training and follow up.
- ***The importance of sharing efforts with the State following a bottom up approach.*** When IPEDEHP began its work in the 1980s, it focused on schools and local authorities. Over time it has established linkages with Ministry of Education offices at the local, departmental

and regional levels. Today IPEDEHP has formal agreements with 5 departmental and regional offices of the Ministry of Education and with several Superior Pedagogical Institutes to train teachers in human rights and democracy. Its contacts with the Ministry of Education in Lima are of a personal nature between Ministry of Education and IPEDEHP staff who know one another.

At the time this study was being carried out, there was a tremendous demand for IPEDEHP's training courses and its materials. This demand exceeded IPEDEHP's capacity to respond due to limitations in financing. This demand did not just come from teachers but from other sectors, such as young people and community leaders—the former provoked by IPEDEHP's training program for social leaders.

LINKAGES WITH OTHER INSTITUTIONS THAT WORK IN THE AREA OF HUMAN RIGHTS

What IPEDEHP has done as an institution cannot be explained without having a broader understanding of the context within which IPEDEHP operates. As we shall see in Chapter VII (summary of the field study), 11 of the 20 community leaders interviewed for the study had some prior knowledge/experience in human rights through working directly in the human rights area and/or having received prior training in human rights. The remainder, while they may not have had either prior knowledge of or experience with human rights, were selected for their years of experience working as leaders in marginal areas where they have been affiliated with grass roots organizations and movements focusing on assisting Peru's poor and marginalized populations. This background has permitted them to take maximum advantage of what they learned at the course to be effective as leaders.

IPEDEHP, since it was established in 1985, has worked very closely with the National Human Rights Coordinator. The current President of IPEDEHP, Rosa María Mujica, took a leave of absence from IPEDEHP between 1992 and 1995 to assume the position of Executive Secretary of the National Human Rights Coordinator. This, combined with the fact that she continues being a member of the counsel that provides oversight to the National Human Rights Coordinator, has permitted IPEDEHP to maintain visibility in the human rights sector in Perú. As we will see in Chapter VI, the idea of a program to train community leaders in democracy, human rights, and citizen participation was born during the period when Rosa María Mujica was Executive Secretary of the National Human Rights Coordinator.

The relationship between IPEDEHP and the Peruvian Network for Education in Human Rights and Peace has always been very close. IPEDEHP founded the Network in 1986 along with the Legal Defense Institute (IDL), the Episcopal Commission for Social Action (CEAS), and the Andean Commission of Jurists (CAJ). Today the Network brings together 70 groups that are involved in human rights education in Peru. IPEDEHP is a member of the Executive Pole of the Network. Throughout the years it has shared its methodology and materials with members of the Network. If it weren't for this close relationship with members of the Network, IPEDEHP would not have been able to launch or carry out the follow-up with the community leaders that it trains.

FUTURE PERSPECTIVES

IPEDEHP is currently at an important juncture, at a time when it needs take some key decisions that will affect its future as an institution. IPEDEHP staff need to answer an important question. Should IPEDEHP remain an institution that devotes itself primarily to training in human rights and democracy, or should IPEDEHP, in keeping with the way it has evolved, focus on playing a leadership role in education in human rights and democracy? If it decides to follow the latter route, IPEDEHP would direct its energies primarily toward carrying out innovative pilot projects, developing and disseminating new training materials in human rights and democracy for the formal and non-formal sectors, and doing assessments of its experience--all with the purpose of sharing with others.

The way in which the institution operates, the composition of its staff, and the types of financial resources it seeks to cover its operations will depend, in large part, on how it answers this question.

HOW IPEDEHP IS SEEN WITHIN AND OUTSIDE OF PERU

As part of the study I interviewed 45 people working with organizations in and outside of Peru that have worked closely with IPEDEHP. This is what they had to say about IPEDEHP.

1. IPEDEHP's image within Peru

For the organizations that know it well IPEDEHP has a very positive image. It has the reputation of being a dynamic, well established group that has the capacity to relate to others. It is seen as a serious, transparent organization that produces results. The members of their staff have a clear idea of who they are and where they want to go. IPEDEHP is recognized as the only NGO in Peru that dedicates itself exclusively to human rights education.

There is unanimous praise for the quality of its courses, its highly participatory training methodology and that fact that, through its training, it manages to change attitudes and strengthen values. IPEDEHP is also seen as a highly collaborative group. They are always ready to share their materials and methodologies with other NGOs.

The following box contains observations about IPEDEHP made by individuals and representatives of Peruvian organizations who know IPEDEHP's work. These observations support the comments made above:

IPEDDEHP SEEN BY INDIVIDUALS AND ORGANIZATIONS WITHIN PERU

- ***Sofia Macher, Executive Secretary of the National Coordinator on Human Rights, Lima:*** “IPEDDEHP is a group that specializes in education in human rights and that is known for its capacity in education. They are the best. I have very high regard for their professionalism. The organizations that belong to the Coordinadora that do human rights training have a high level of respect for IPEDDEHP. Their methodology is a contribution to the work of institutions that also work in human rights education. IPEDDEHP is the organization that has given the most support to the Peruvian Human Rights Education Network. It is a leader in the area of education in human rights.”
- ***Father Felipe Zagarra, theology professor at the Catholic University in Lima and member of the Peruvian Human Rights Education Network:*** “They are a star. They stand out for: (1) their conceptual capacity; (2) their creativity; and (3) their ability to form networks.”
- ***Nancy Astete, responsible for education in the Vicarage of Juli and a member of the Peruvian Human Rights Education Network, Puno*** “An institution that accomplishes its objectives. They apply all the external help they receive to promote training in human rights. They are friends. They have taken our work very seriously. We have had relationships with other groups but nothing that matches the nature of our relationship with IPEDDEHP.”
- ***Jorge Santistevan de Noriega, Human Rights Ombudsman, Lima:*** “IPEDDEHP is capable of putting passion and sentiment into its work. Its methodology for providing training in human rights is not traditional. They have designed an approach that, through games and sentiments, incorporates values and draws people to human rights. Its emphasis on values and sentiments in its methodology is valuable. However, the objective of operating through networks is what most impresses me and what I consider to be IPEDDEHP’s most valuable attribute” .
- ***Walter Palomino Cabezas, National Human Rights Counsel of the Ministry of Labor, Lima:*** “We signed an agreement with IPEDDEHP in 1997 to carry out a training course for primary and secondary teachers in Lima and in San Lorenzo de Quinti, Huarochiri. The training course was successful. Based on this experience we have coordinated a series of events with IPEDDEHP, among them an additional workshop for teachers. IPEDDEHP has also participated as a member of the jury for the first national drawing and painting competition for children in human rights which we carried out in coordination with the Ministry of Education. We have plans to coordinate with IPEDDEHP for other specific training courses.”
- ***Flor Amorós, Manthoc coordinator and member of the team of teacher promoters of the Peruvian Human Rights Education Network, Cajamarca:*** “It’s the maximum. IPEDDEHP has given us a space to train ourselves and update our skills. They have been supporting us with training over the years. We consider all the members of IPEDDEHP as family. They have such a special charisma. We share the same ideals and values. They are always supporting us. To encounter them is to recharge our batteries. We learn new training methodologies, we improve the activities we are already carrying out. They have made a reality out of the distant sky. Sincere friendship. Horizontal dialogue.”
- ***Hubert Lanssiers, Priest, member of the ad-hoc commission to review cases of people unjustly incarcerated as terrorists, Lima.*** “I had never seen a methodology so open, so dynamic, so realistic. Realistic in the sense that people who come from far away to receive the training feel so deeply committed. The training creates ties of friendship. One feels involved”.
- ***Carlos Basombrío, Members of the Board of Directors of the Legal Defense Institute (IDL), Lima.*** “What the people say about IPEDDEHP is true. They do consistent work, their message is clear and it is practical. Their strength is their capacity to apply their approach with local groups.”

- **Martín Vegas, Executive Secretary of Foro Educativo and a former member of the Peruvian Human Rights Education Network, Lima:** *“IPEDEHP, in the case of Peru, has become relevant in ways that one never would have imagined. In the school, they permit teachers to work with the culture of human rights using the affective/corporal dimensions. If one doesn’t live, one doesn’t feel. If one doesn’t experiment, there are no changes. Much of their work with the Peruvian Human Rights Education Network has been assumed by the rest of us.”*
- **Gloria Helfer, Former Minister of Education, founder of Foro Educativo and Executive Director of EDUCA, Lima:** *“IPEDEHP distinguishes itself by its capacity to take decisions, its sense of security, and the honesty and personal integrity of its members. It is a group of extraordinary quality. They have an enormous sensitivity toward a country that is in such pain. They approach what they do with a broad vision. They emphasize that everyone has to look at her/himself in order to be able to look at others. Their methodology is very creative. They have evolved, finding new ways of working, new resources. With regard to their profile and the way in which they work, they feel an enormous responsibility to maintain autonomy from the State. They have taken a concrete, legitimate and respectable option to remain very small doing excellent “filigree” work. The cost is not having a sufficient dissemination of what they do”.*

2. *IPEDEHP’s image outside of Peru*

IPEDEHP also has a positive image among organizations outside of Peru that know its work. In the Latin American region, it is seen as a leader in human rights education.

At the same time there are concerns. A member of a cooperating agency that I interviewed pointed out that IPEDEHP had not collected data on the impact of its efforts. He also pointed out that IPEDEHP still had not established formal relations with the Ministry of Education in Lima. Another challenge, cited by a human rights group outside of Peru, is doing follow-up of a program such as that with the community leaders where there is so much demand (although this person also recognized that IPEDEHP has accomplished a great deal in the area of follow-up).

Below, some specific comments made by people outside of Peru who I was able to interview about IPEDEHP.

IPEDEHP SEEN BY INDIVIDUALS AND ORGANIZATIONS OUTSIDE OF PERU

Jorge Osorio, President of CEAAL, Chile: “IPEDEHP is of those institutions that forms the frame of reference for CEAAL’s human rights education network. They do persistent work with good results. IPEDEHP was the coordinator of CEAAL’s human rights education network. They are highly thought of by members of the Network. The external opinion is very positive.”

Dina Rodriguez, Education Director of the Interamerican Institute on Human Rights (IIDH) located in San José, Costa Rica: “I became acquainted with IPEDEHP’s work from outside of Peru, through their materials and the repercussions of their work that go beyond their national frontier. I think that the work they do has been as a pioneer in this field, not only in Peru, but throughout Latin America. Perhaps their most significant accomplishment that I have been able to identify is their having arrived with messages of human rights and peace to so many different places in their country, including the most dangerous areas in Peru during its most difficult times. IPEDEHP has three particularly valuable elements that need to be highlighted: (1) the way they mobilize and promote the creation of other civil society organizations that work in human rights education as well as their recent support of the Human Rights Ombudsman’s Office; (2) their commitment to their work; one knows what their objectives and goals are; and (3) the professionalism and transparency with which they work in the field of human rights education.”

Eduardo Rojas, Executive Secretary of the Chilean Vicarage for Social Outreach: “IPEDEHP has among its strengths: (1) Accumulated experience in education in human rights; (2) A consolidated team with a high level of commitment and experience in the area; (3) Their specialization in formal education; without leaving aside their work in non-formal education. What has given them major successes and prestige is their excellent work introducing human rights into the school system; (4) Their “policy of alliances”, in particular their support to and membership in the Peruvian Human Rights Education Network; IPEDEHP has been key in its creation and a pillar in its maintenance. (5) They have generated relations of trust with cooperation agencies and other groups. They are credible and they make opportune changes to maintain their credibility.”

Violeta Bermúdez, Coordinator for Human Rights and Democratic Institutions for the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) in Peru: “IPEDEHP uses a methodology that has been demonstrated to be effective and that should be replicated by other organizations. They have materials that should be used by other organizations. They are very receptive to outside suggestions. When they develop documents, they seek the views of people outside of their organization. This results in a product that is viewed not just from one optic but several, which produces networks of cooperation.”

CHAPTER VI

A FOCUS ON IPEDEHP'S PROGRAM TO TRAIN COMMUNITY LEADERS IN HUMAN RIGHTS DEMOCRACY AND CITIZEN PARTICIPATION

This chapter and the next focus on IPEDEHP's program to train community leaders in Human Rights, Democracy and Citizen Participation which began in 1996. The program, financed by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), has been designed and implemented by IPEDEHP in collaboration with two key human rights institutions in Peru which are party to the program agreement: the National Human Rights Coordinator and the Office of the Human Rights Ombudsman. Its title, *"You Have Rights: Know Them, Promote Them, Defend Them"*, summarizes in a very appropriate fashion the objectives of the program.

One of the key concerns of the National Human Rights Coordinator, and particularly its Executive Director, was the lack of knowledge among Peruvian citizens regarding their rights which has made it possible for their rights to be abused. The challenge is sharing with the Peruvian population, and in particular Peru's poor and marginalized populations, what their rights are. This is at the heart of the program to train community leaders.

When the project was designed in 1999 there was an attempt to build a bridge between civil society human rights institutions and the State. Up until then the relationship had traditionally been one of confrontation. For this reason a decision was made, at USAID's insistence, to identify an institution from the State who could be party to the project agreement. The Human Rights Commission of the National Congress was selected as the initial counterpart. During 1996 three training courses were carried out with the Congress as a co-participant. It was not an easy decision to make and it resulted in long and difficult discussions between the three parties to arrive at minimum agreements. At the end of 1996 the Office of the Human Rights Coordinator was established by an act of the Peruvian Congress to provide oversight on the human rights situation in Peru. At that point the decision was made that the State institution that should be part of the project agreement from then on should be the Human Rights Ombudsman's Office. IPEDEHP and the National Human Rights Coordinator have worked with the Human Rights Ombudsman's Office since then.

It is also important to point out that, at the beginning, all three parties to the agreement –the members of the IPEDEHP team, those from the Human Rights Ombudsman's Office and the National Human Rights Coordinator – never imagined the strong impact that this program would have on many of the leaders who participated in it, their families, and people in their communities who they affected upon returning from training. They also could not have predicted the tremendous number and variety of multiplier activities carried out by the community leaders when they returned to their communities.

The program lasts three days and uses participatory methodologies that IPEDEHP has developed and validated over the years working with Peruvian teachers. To date this program has counted on the commitment and close collaboration of many people and institutions that work in the places where the training has been carried out. As of November, 1998 when this report was completed, the program had trained 897 community leaders in 11 departments²⁰ of Peru in 13 training programs.

²⁰ Ayacucho, Cusco, San Martín, Arequipa, Pucallpa, Puno, Trujillo, Piura, Cajamarca, Iquitos, Lima (Distrito of Lima: Callao, Carretera Central, Lurín).

These programs have been carried out through a donation of \$400,000 from USAID over a two and a half year period. USAID funds have been used by IPEDEHP to cover the following costs:

- Salaries of IPEDEHP staff that participated in the program,
- Development and reproduction of materials,
- Costs to organize and carry out the training programs: transportation and lodging for the participants and the trainers,
- Follow-up sessions at the departmental level within three months of the training,
- Evaluation sessions at the departmental level annually thereafter,
- Annual meetings of the community leaders in Lima,
- Support to local counterparts,
- Activities to disseminate the experience.

Listed below are some of the characteristics of the 897 community leaders that have been trained to date:

Occupation:

- 33% are ***professionals***: lawyers, psychologists, social workers, primary, secondary and university professors or ***university students***.
- 12% are ***technicians or promoters*** (social, health, popular education).
- 6% work in ***occupations that require a low level of formal education*** (salesman in the local market, shine shoes, house wife etc.)
- 13% are ***affiliated with religious groups*** (work in a parish or vicarage as catechists, pastoral agents, religious motivators)
- 6% work in ***the defense of human rights***, either as a full time job or as a side occupation.
- 5% work in ***municipalities***. 13 are aldermen in their municipalities; 11 are mayors, governors, prefects or deputy prefects; and 5 are justices of the peace.

Ages:

- 2% are under 19 years of age
- 24% are between 20 and 29 years of age
- 33% are between 30 and 39 years of age
- 27% are between 40 and 49 years of age
- 10% are between 50 and 59 years of age
- 4% are older than 59 years of age

STRUCTURE/ORGANIZATION OF THE TRAINING PROGRAM

It is not possible to describe the training course without commenting on the steps that precede and follow it. These steps are described below:

1. *First step: formal agreements with local counterparts.*

Upon identifying the departments where the training course is to be carried out, IPEDEHP selects the local counterpart(s) who assume many of the responsibilities related to the program. These include: selecting the leaders, identifying the specific local where the training course will take place and where participants will be lodged, and securing the commitment of the community leaders selected to attend the course (see step 2 below) to do a multiplier effect after the course. IPEDEHP's objective is to strengthen these local institutions and to establish an environment in which the community leaders work closely with them after the training, in this way strengthening the role of these institutions in human rights and democracy. In order to do this, IPEDEHP signs an agreement with the counterpart in which it establishes clear responsibilities, both on the part of IPEDEHP and the local institution.

2. *Second step: selecting the community leaders*

The counterpart institutions are responsible for selecting individuals who are recognized as leaders in their communities. Given their backgrounds and stature, these individuals arrive at the training course with a rich reservoir of knowledge regarding diverse areas of Peru's social and political life. A pre-requisite is that they commit themselves to carry out a multiplier effect upon returning to their communities.

3. *Third step: carrying out the three day training course.*

The training courses are carried out in a centrally located location in each department. Since most of the participants are from small towns and rural areas, a locale is elected where they can receive lodging during the course. The trainers stay with the participants to maximize contact with them during the workshop. One or two representatives from the local counterpart also attend as participants. The training course is very intense. Participants are kept busy between 12 and 14 hours per day.

The course is inaugurated with welcoming remarks from the five organizations that sponsor the course: IPEDEHP, the National Human Rights Coordinator, the Human Rights Ombudsman's Office, USAID, and the local counterpart. The first day and a half of the workshop is dedicated to the theme of human rights. The afternoon of the second day is devoted to democracy and the methodology used in the training course. During the third morning the participants form groups, according to where they live. Each group is responsible for preparing a work plan for implementing what they learned at the training course when they return to their communities. The local counterparts participate in the preparation of the work plans for which they will be providing follow up.

During the training course, the other two institutions that are party to the project agreement – the National Human Rights Coordinator and the Office of the Human Rights Ombudsman—give presentations. These presentations stress how the community leaders can take advantage of the services provided by these organizations. At the closing session the Human Rights Ombudsman, Jorge Santistevan de Noriega, talks with the leaders, hears their concerns, responds to questions, and charges them with the responsibility of being human rights promoters in their communities. His encouragement that they contact the Office of the Human Rights Ombudsman when they need help is a strong motivation for the community leaders.

The box, below, provides an illustrative agenda for one of the training courses.

ILLUSTRATIVE AGENDA FOR A TRAINING COURSE

FIRST DAY

08:30 - 09:30	Enrollment, participants receive credentials and training materials, pre-test
09:30 - 10:00	INAUGURATION OF THE COURSE
	PART ONE: Initial Activities
10:00 - 10:15	1.1 Presentation of the trainers and the course materials
10:15 - 10:35	1.2 Dynamic: <i>Presentation of the Participants</i>
10:35 - 10:55	1.3 Dynamic: <i>Course Expectations</i>
10:55 - 11:10	1.4 Presentation of the course objectives
11:10 - 11:30	1.5 Development of rules outlining behaviors expected at the course
11:30 - 11:50	COFFEE
	PART TWO: Human Rights
11:50 - 12:00	2.1 Dynamic to form groups: <i>The Families</i>
12:00 - 13:00	2.2 Game: <i>The Road to a Diagnosis</i>
13:00 - 15:00	LUNCH-REST
15:00 - 16:30	2.3 Dynamic of the cards: <i>Organizing Human Rights Concepts</i>
16:30 - 16:50	COFFEE
16:50 - 17:00	2.4 Dynamic for forming groups: <i>The Ambulatory Musicians</i>
17:00 - 18:20	2.5 Group work with items. 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 of the Carpeta
18:20 - 19:30	Panel: <i>The National Human Rights Coordinator; The Human Rights Ombudsman</i>
19:30 - 20:30	DINNER

SECOND DAY

07:00 - 08:30	BREAKFAST
08:30 - 10:00	2.6 Presentation of the handouts in the Carpeta
10:00 - 11:30	Panel: <i>Rights of Women; Rights of Children</i>
11:30 - 11:55	COFFEE
11:55 - 12:15	2.7 Synthesis of part two. Dynamic: <i>Brainstorming</i>
	PART THREE: Democracy
12:15 - 12:30	3.1 Dynamic to form groups: <i>The King Rules</i>
12:30 - 13:30	3.2 Game: <i>Promoting a Debate</i>
13:30 - 15:00	LUNCH-REST
15:00 - 16:00	3.3 Dynamic of the cards: <i>Clarifying Concepts of Democracy</i>
16:00 - 16:20	COFFEE
16:20 - 16:40	3.4 Synthesis of part three. Dynamic: <i>Brainstorming</i>
	PART FOUR: Methodological Principles for Educating in Human Rights and Democracy
16:40 - 16:50	4.1 Dynamic for form groups: <i>The Animals</i>
16:50 - 18:00	4.2 Principals: departing from reality, integration, dialogue, being critical, activity, expressing feelings and developing the affective, participation
	4.3 Dynamic: <i>The Human Body</i>
18:00 - 18:20	4.4 Synthesis of part three. Dynamic: <i>Brainstorming</i>
18:30 - 19:30	DINNER
20:00 - 22:00	Cultural Activity

THIRD DAY

07:00 - 08:30	BREAKFAST
	PART FIVE: Defining Tasks
08:30 - 11:00	Formation of groups by sub-regions, defining, selecting and planning education activities. Planning follow up activities
11:00 - 11:30	COFFEE
	Evaluation and post-test
11:30 - 12:30	DIALOGUE: <i>The Human Rights Ombudsman:</i> Dr. Jorge Santistevan de Noriega, Human Rights Ombudsman
12:30 - 14:00	CLOSING: Presentation of Certificates, Farewell Lunch

4. *Fourth step: follow up provided by IPEDEHP and its local counterparts*

An aspect that distinguishes the training provided by IPEDEHP from other training programs is the follow up that the participants receive once they return to their communities. This follow-up comes, in many instances, directly from the counterpart institutions that selected them. In Arequipa, for example, CECYCAP maintains contact between the course graduates and IPEDEHP. It brings the course graduates together, gives them materials sent by IPEDEHP, and it accompanies them in carrying out their individual and group work plans. CECYCAP has provided its offices for meetings of the course graduates. Also, with funds from other donations, the counterpart sometimes offers financial assistance (money for materials and local travel) so that the participants can do their follow up work.

The other accompaniment comes directly from IPEDEHP. Three months after the training course one of the trainers returns to the department where the course was given in order to meet with the course graduates (or, for those who can't attend the meeting, their delegates) to hear how the graduates have done in applying their work plans. These meetings provide the graduates with an opportunity to share their own experiences among themselves. It also gives IPEDEHP an opportunity to share new knowledge and techniques.

In addition, once a year, the IPEDEHP trainer meets with the course graduates, and often with people they have trained, to carry out an evaluation of the work done in each Department. The local counterparts participate in all the meetings.

Provided below, in the form of an illustration, is the program that was used in 1998 to carry out the annual evaluation of a group trained in Lima in 1997:

EVALUATION SESSION FOR THE CENTRAL HIGHWAY (LIMA)

1. Objectives

- Evaluate the successes and difficulties encountered by the human rights and democracy promoters in the Central Highway section of Lima.
- Establish the work plan for 1999.
- Determine criteria for selecting the delegates who will attend the Second National Meeting of Human Rights Promoters to be held in Lima in February, 1999

2. Agenda

09:00 - 09:10	Opening session
09:10 - 09:35	Dynamic for greetings: <i>"The Homage"</i>
09:35 - 09:50	Expectations for the day
09:50 - 10.50	Working in groups by zones: Matrix/Posterboard with activities carried out using drawings: <i>"What we have done, with whom we have worked"</i>
10.50- 11.20	Refreshments
11.20- 12.00	Plenary: Interpretation of the drawings
12.00- 12.30	Working in groups: <i>"Looking at our accomplishments"</i> : Preparing the Fruits <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Personal - Group - In the community
12.30 - 13.00	Working in groups: <i>"Signaling difficulties"</i> : Preparing the Clouds <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Personal - Group - In the community
13.00- 13.30	Plenary: Putting together the tree and the clouds Participants glue the fruits to the tree. How do they feel? Conclusions? Participants glue the difficulties in the clouds How do they feel? What specific problems have impeded achieving the accomplishments they would like?
14.30- 14.45	Dynamic: <i>The cat and the little tigers"</i>
14:45 - 15.15	Work in groups and as a plenary: <i>"Looking toward the future"</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Developing criteria for the next year that take into consideration the difficulties encountered - Each group selects a rhythm and prepares a song that reflects the challenges they face.
15:15- 15.45	-Plenary: Participants put their criteria on the wall and present their songs
15:45 - 16:15	Criteria for selecting delegates to attend the annual meeting in February, 1999.
16.15- 17.15	Various: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identification card: list of who deserves to receive one; need to send two photos; commitment of whole group for actions of promoters who receive ID cards . - Bulletin for promoters: request that leaders write for the bulletin - 50th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights: how each plans to celebrate
17.15- 18.15	Dynamic: <i>"The human chair"</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How did they feel? What impeded their completing the task? What is the relation between the dynamic and our work as promoters? Evaluation of the day.

In addition, once a year IPEDEHP organizes an annual meeting of community leaders who promote human rights in Lima. Attendees from each department are selected by their companions at the annual evaluation meetings at the department level which takes place within a few months before the Lima meeting. Representatives from the counterpart institutions at the local level also attend the annual meeting in Lima as do representatives of the National Human

Rights Coordinator and the Office of the Human Rights Ombudsman in Lima and from the departments where the course was taught.

The meeting is used as an opportunity to share successes (individual and by department) as well as challenges and difficulties that the course graduates have encountered along the way. Participants are also exposed to new dynamics and games and they are provided an opportunity to explore some of the human rights and democracy concepts in more depth. Each group of delegates also uses this annual meeting to do planning for the next year.

An important strategy followed by IPEDEHP, in accordance with its philosophy of “weaving ties of friendship, trust, and commitment”, is the formation of networks. During the annual meeting in Lima in February, 1998 the community leaders and IPEDEHP agreed to form a “National Community Leaders Human Rights Network”. Several of the graduates of the IPEDEHP course are in the process of forming (some more successfully than others) their own networks at the departmental level.

IPEDEHP has also just initiated a bulletin directed toward community leaders who are graduates of the training course. This bulletin has two objectives; (1) provide the course graduates with a mechanism for sharing experiences; and (2) serve as an additional channel for IPEDEHP to share new techniques and clarify concepts with the course graduates.

AN ATTEMPT TO SHARE THE “FLAVOR” OF AN IPEDEHP TRAINING COURSE

It is difficult to appreciate the impact of a training course such as that offered by IPEDEHP without attending one of the courses. Fortunately, I was able to do this in late May of 1998 when I finished my first round of field work. Between May 27 and 29, 1998 I participated in a training course held in Cajamarca along with 80 additional participants from the Department.²¹ The training course was carried out in a retreat across from the Inca Thermal Baths, in the outskirts of the city of Cajamarca.

Below, I will attempt to share some of what I experienced over these three days, so that the reader can obtain a “flavor” of the training course:

Principles for an education in human rights and democracy

For starters, it is important to point out the seven “principles for an education in human rights and democracy”, which were the base for the methodology used in this training course. These principals are the outgrowth of years of experience working with teachers. Those familiar with the writings of Paolo Freire will find his philosophy of popular education clearly reflected in these principals.

²¹ This is a larger number than usually attend IPEDEHP’s training courses; usually there are between 60 and 70 participants.

PRINCIPLES FOR EDUCATING IN HUMAN RIGHTS²²

1. Depart from reality:

This means knowing all of the characteristics, needs, interests and problems of the trainees, their life experiences, capabilities and limitations and the socio-economic and cultural context in which they live. There is no one “truth”: reality is felt and lived in a very personal manner. That is what distinguishes each of us as people. Trainees know the world they live in much better than the trainers. One must take advantage of the student’s experiences and learn from them. Therefore, everything possible must be done to meet the expectations and needs of each course participant.

2. Activity:

The objective is to get trainees to “learn to learn” throughout their lives. The learning process must be based on the experiences of the trainees. They must be stimulated to want to look for information, to organize their ideas, reflect on and synthesize them. Each trainee must build on his/her knowledge and opinions, and accept the consequences of his/her actions. Individual and group activity must be combined to promote inter-learning. This permits trainees to contrast opinions and experiences, to promote taking collective decisions in a democratic fashion.

3. Horizontal communication:

People need to know that they are different but equal. The key instrument for accomplishing this is dialogue between two or more people who share their thoughts, feelings, and emotions in an atmosphere of mutual respect. To be able to dialogue is to know how to listen, with the certainty that--by listening to others--trainees help each other in their self affirmation and in the growth of their self-esteem.

4. Developing the capability to be critical.

Being critical is being able to give a fair opinion; to judge ideas, people and acts in a serious fashion. Having the ability to be critical is being able to recognize the positive and the negative, to look for alternatives, being attentive to what occurs around one’s self, utilizing one’s creativity and imagination to look for solutions.

5. Promoting the expression and development of the affective.

A key conviction is that the affective is fundamental for educating in human rights and democracy. It is only possible to learn values if the training methodologies take into account the participant’s feelings. The expression of sentiments cannot be obligatory. Trainees express sentiments only when it is agreeable for them to do so. Trainees must be helped to understand their sentiments. It is also important to speak positively of sentiments.

6. Promoting participation.

Participation is fundamental for a democratic existence. To participate is to take an active role in something, as opposed to being a spectator. It is to act decisively, responsibly, with commitment, and initiative. One can confirm that people participate when: they are consulted, take decisions, organize.

7. Integration

The assumption is that we are all integral beings; that we are biological, psychological and social units. We must accept ourselves and others as valuable in our own right, unique, different, with our own characteristics. The task of the trainer is to promote knowledge and understanding of one’s body, stimulate the capacity of the trainees to know, understand, create, build, discover, question and project their values. Course participants must have the ability to promote moral justice, promote valuing their own cultural and social identity, recognize and respect the differences that exist between diverse social and cultural groups.

²² The contents of this text box are a synopsis of a handout provided to the participants at the end of the training course.

The learning uses as a point of departure the experience of the trainees

It is interesting to note that, as participants in the training course, we were not exposed formally to these principles until the last day of the course. An eight page handout, which summarizes the principles, was shared with us once we finished discussing the methodology we had experienced throughout the training course. Waiting for the participants to first identify what they learned before sharing the contents of the handout underlines one of the very principles outlined in the handout: that learning has to use as a point of departure the experiences of the learner.

Constant participation in interactive activities

After the course began we were involved in a series of activities that had us occupied every minute of the training course. We were often in small groups playing games, preparing role plays and songs, reading documents aloud and discussing their significance for our lives. At other times, we met as a group to discuss the dynamics we had been involved in or that we had learned in our small group break outs. All the dynamics required us to move our bodies and have a good deal of physical contact. We hugged one another, took each other's hands in order to carry out a specific dynamic.

Constant contact with our feelings; ongoing discussion of the way we were going to apply what we learned

At the end of most of the activities we met as a group to discuss: how we felt while we were carrying out the activity, what we learned, how we could apply what we learned in our communities. These discussions were important for the learning process because they obligated us to internalize what we learned. It is important to note that the first question asked of us after each activity (game, role play, dynamic) was how we felt when we were engaged in the activity. Only after we answered this question did the conversation turn to what we had observed/learned.

Emphasis on the affective

In many of the regions where IPEDEHP has carried out this training course, the wounds of the violence are still raw. A number of the activities gave us the opportunity, in an environment that was not menacing, to share fears and worries resulting from these experiences. For example, in one activity we were asked to form groups. We were told that we had been displaced from our homes due to terrorism. We had been lost and we had to find our "families", based on a piece of paper we had each been given that identified the name of our "family". We had one minute to find each other! In another instance, in another game, there were cards that asked us to remember a time in our childhood when we cried. In others we were asked to remember situations of fear produced by terrorism. These moments were therapeutic to a number of the individuals participating in the training course.

The tremendous heterogeneity among the course participants

When we entered the training salon in Cajamarca the first day of the course the first thing I noted was the tremendous variety: in faces, bodies, clothing of the participants. There were lawyers, social workers, doctors, law and education students from the university, primary and secondary teachers, leaders of rural community defense groups, leaders of women's clubs. Some of us had Masters and Doctoral degrees. Others had little more than two years of primary education.

Although most of us wore western dress, some of the women wore the typical dress from the Peruvian highlands.

The dynamics and the games took advantage of this heterogeneity

The dynamics and the games, in addition to “breaking the ice”, took maximum advantage of the tremendous heterogeneity in the course participants. Playing games together each of us had an opportunity to provide our opinions on topics related to democracy and human rights using as a basis our own experiences. This obligated us to listen to our companions and learn from the tremendous richness that each of us brought to the dynamic or game. One campesina lady, with two years of primary education, told me at the beginning of the course that she felt very “small” surrounded by lawyers, teachers and social workers doctors . However, after a few hours of involvement in the dynamics and games she told me she was feeling that she was being treated as an equal and valued as a person, perhaps for the first time in her life. A lawyer, who confessed that at the beginning that he felt very uncomfortable because he had to interact with the campesina, realized through the activities that the campesina had life experiences that were very valuable and that he had a great deal to learn from her.

EXAMPLE OF A GAME AND A DYNAMIC

Provided below, are two examples of activities that took place during the course. The first was carried out in groups of six people the first day of the training program. The second was carried out with the full group the second morning, once there has been some trust established among the course participants. The first combines the cognitive and the affective. The second gives much more emphasis to the affective.

Game: “Road to Diagnosis”

This game was initially developed by IPEDEHP during the 1980s for use with teachers. Its objective is to provide participants with an opportunity to not only learn what their rights are, but to—in a therapeutic environment--openly share feelings and experiences from the worst years of the violence that gripped Peru. The cards we used were developed specifically to be used with the community leaders.

This is a table game that consists of a game board, cards, dice, and pawns that each person moves according to the number he/she rolls on the dice. If the person lands on a yellow space that says “Breaking the Ice”, the person has to take a yellow card and carry out the instructions on the card. Some examples: “*Dance with a companion in your group while the others sing a song*”, “*Make a proclamation in favor of peace*”, “*Hug the person to your left*”.

If the person lands on a pink space with a question mark, he/she must take a card and respond aloud to the question asked in the card. For example, “*Do you think there are still cases of torture in Peru? Do you know a case? Tell about it*”, “*When you were a child were you scared?*”, “*Do you think boys and girls are alike? How?*” The answers were very interesting.

If the person lands on a light blue space which says “Say it in Few Words” he/she has to take a light blue card, read it aloud to the group, and then each person has to give a response. For example, “*Do men have the right to hit women?*”; “*Tell of a time when you cried as a child*”; “*If you had complete power, what would you do?*”. The large variety of responses given to these questions by members of our group permitted us share experiences and learn from one another.

At the end of the game, we commented among ourselves regarding what we had learned. During the plenary session that followed we shared what we had learned with the other groups and how we had felt playing the game. We also spoke of possible applications of the game once we returned to our communities.

Dynamic: “The Greeting”²³

During the morning of the second day the trainer asked us all to stand in the middle of the meeting room. Our initial instruction was to walk around without talking or looking at anyone. After a few minutes we were told we could look at one another but could not talk. Finally we were told to greet one another as though we were good friends who hadn’t seen one other for two years.

With the second instruction, one began to see smiles on people’s faces and nods of their heads as they silently greeted one another. With the third instruction, the meeting room erupted. People who did not know each other hugged as if they were greatest of friends. There were shouts of joy as people hugged each other. Within a short period I received (and gave) big hugs to at least 30 people. This was new to most of us. We had never done anything like it, and we really enjoyed this activity!

At the end we formed a circle. The trainer asked us: How did we feel when we couldn’t look at anyone (very lonely, scared). How did we feel when we could establish eye contact (less lonely...the looks said something....). How did we feel when we could hug and talk (very happy, accompanied, content...). The trainers then asked what we have learned from this dynamic. The trainer finished asking us to comment on the relation this exercise had to our work as human rights promoters. Again, the answers were very interesting.

²³ IPEDEHP, depending on the size and nature of the group, occasionally makes changes in the training courses for community leaders. This dynamic was used at our training course in Cajamarca, although it does not appear on the illustrative agenda that appears in the first section of this chapter.

The dynamics have a sequence which facilitate the acquisition of human rights and democracy concepts

The dynamics were selected in a precise fashion, each adequate for the moment. Each dynamic responded to one of the specific objectives for the workshop. They built up gradually in intensity. The dynamics provided a nice combination of opportunities for reflection, diversion, and sharing of feelings.

One's daily life serves as the point of departure for learning

A very interesting aspect of IPEDEHP's training methodology which stands out is that the daily lives of the participants—their experiences, their successes, their difficulties—serve as a base for the learning process throughout the program: for learning concepts of human rights and what to do when they are violated, democracy, and so on.

Living democracy and human rights throughout the process of the training course

The training course is designed so that the participants live the values that are implicit in the practice of democracy and human rights. One of the first things we did, as a group, was to develop norms of behavior to be followed during the workshop. As a group we agreed on sanctions that would be levied on guilty parties when they violate the norms. These sanctions had to be constructive and not hurt anyone. We chose three sanctions: tell a joke, dance, or tell a riddle.²⁴ We also selected three companions who were responsible for making sure these norms were adhered to and that the sanctions were judiciously applied.

The people responsible for oversight of the norms and sanctions took their jobs very seriously, evaluating at the beginning of each session the norms that had been violated. One afternoon I arrived five minutes late and I had to dance with the rest of the individuals that were also late. In another instance I had to tell a joke. Even the trainers did not escape the sanctions when they also were late to a session.

A party along the way

The second night of the workshop we all attended a party—the community leaders, people they invited, members of the counterpart institutions that were attending the course, NGOs, the whole IPEDEHP team. It was a night of music, dances, poems, typical songs from the regions represented by the participants. This provided an environment of camaraderie as well as clean fun and diversion.

At the beginning of the next day, after an opening dynamic, we reflected on the party the night before. The trainers began by asking us: How had we felt at the party? Why have a party in a training course on human rights? What had we learned? What lessons could we take from this experience? The responses from the community leaders permitted us to recognize, among others, that working in human rights is working for the achievement of happiness.

²⁴ In societies such as Peru, when someone violates a norm of conduct, he/she: receives a physical punishment, is isolated for a period of time from the group, or is asked to do a task where he/she is ridiculed. In this case the emphasis is on searching for “punishments” that are constructive and agreeable and that give the community leader idea of how they can look for similar types of punishments.

Strengthening bonds of friendship, trust, and commitment

When we developed our work plans to replicate what we learned in our communities the last day of the course, the atmosphere was charged with electricity. Groups of individuals with very different occupations and educational backgrounds, who two days before had not known each other, were united by location developing their work plans and defining how they were going to work together to apply what they learned in their communities. It was clear that there was commitment to put into effect what they learned immediately upon returning to their communities. One also noted new friendships.

TOOLS THAT PARTICIPANTS TAKE BACK WITH THEM TO THEIR HOMES WHEN THEY FINISH THE TRAINING COURSE

At the end of the course, when the participants depart for their communities, they take with them new knowledge, ideas of how to apply the methodology they were exposed to, and a variety of materials that they received and learned how to use while they were at the course. These materials, all written in an easy to understand fashion and presented in a very attractive way, are the instruments they use to create a multiplier effect--be it replicating the course, giving short talks, preparing radio and television programs, preparing new materials.

These tools are described below:

1. “Carpeta”: “You Have Rights: Know them, Promote them, Defend them”

This is the key tool that participants receive at the training course. It is given to them at the beginning of the course along with the Methodological Guide that will be described below. In the “carpeta” are 12 numbered handouts of between 4 and 12 pages each of which are written in easy to read language and with illustrations that help the reader further understand the written text. The first provides guidelines for using the rest of the handouts and the last, called the “human rights first aid kit”, provides names, addresses, and telephone numbers of all of the institutions in Peru that work in human rights. Each of the remaining handouts cites sources (Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Peruvian Constitution, other Peruvian Laws) that are relevant to the human right that is addressed in the handout. There is also an explanation of how one can tell when one’s rights have been violated. The handouts finish providing counsel of what the individual can do and where he/she can go when the right is violated.

CARPETA
“YOU HAVE RIGHTS: KNOW THEM, PROMOTE THEM, DEFEND THEM”.

1. *Some practical indications that can help you in using this folder*
2. *Hey... what are human rights?*
3. *Who defends human rights in Peru?*
4. *The right to positive self-esteem*
5. *The right to be equal and to have our differences respected*
6. *The rights to physical integrity: no to torture*
7. *Children's rights*
8. *Women's rights*
9. *The rights to citizen participation*
10. *The right to democracy*
11. *The right of to have a human rights ombudsman*
12. *Human rights first aid kit*

2. *Methodological guide.*

The first morning of the course each participant also receives a methodological guide which contains—in a style that is easy to understand and use—the steps for replicating the training course, including how to organize and carry out the dynamics, discussion groups and role plays. The steps follow the agenda for a three day course provided in the first section of this chapter. Several of the course graduates told me during the interviews that this guide is a reference they go to constantly to update their knowledge and to obtain new ideas when they design their own activities once back in their communities. It also helps them to refresh their memories and remember the dynamics they learned at the course.

3. *Games.*

During the course the participants, in groups of six, play two games-- “Carrera al Diagnóstico” (road to diagnosis, theme of human rights) and “Promoviendo el Debate” (Promoting Debate, theme of democracy). At the end of the course each participant receives six copies of each game for use in their own training courses once they return to their communities. They are encouraged to adapt the cards in both games for use with the people with whom they will be working. Several participants have prepared cards for the human rights game that focus on specific rights—such as women’s rights and children’s rights. Some have prepared cards on other themes that go beyond the human rights arena such as environment and health. As we will see in the next chapter, the first thing that the community leaders do, upon returning to their communities, is to play the games with their families.

4. *Principles for an Education in Human Rights and Democracy:*

This handout, of 8 pages, summarizes the methodology used in the training course. It is given to the participants at the end of the course so that they can compare what they learned at the course with these principles. These seven principles are summarized in a box at the beginning of the second section of this chapter.

CHAPTER VII

THE IMPACT OF IPEDEHP'S WORK SEEN FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF ITS PROGRAM DE TRAIN COMMUNITY LEADERS: PERSPECTIVES FROM A FIELD STUDY

This chapter presents the results of a field study carried out in four departments of Peru in order to assess the impact of IPEDEHP's program for community leaders. To facilitate reading this chapter, I have divided it into three sections.

- The first section provides information on the community leaders in the four departments that I visited that are available in IPEDEHP's files.
- The second section provides a description of the sample of 20 community leaders from whom I collected the data for the field study.
- The third section provides—using a combination of testimonies, frequency counts around phenomena that were identified and my personal observations—data regarding what the 20 community leaders thought of the training they received as well as the impact that the training had on them as individuals, their families, and people in their communities who they affected upon returning from the training.

INFORMATION AVAILABLE IN IPEDEHP'S FILE ON THE COMMUNITY LEADERS IN THE FOUR DEPARTMENTS WHERE THE FIELD STUDY WAS CARRIED OUT.

According to IPEDEHP's files 256 community leaders (132 women and 124 men) had received training in the four departments where I carried out the study (Arequipa, Puno, San Martín, Pucallpa). The first to receive training from IPEDEHP were the community leaders from the Department of San Martín (training provided in June, 1996, 23 months before carrying out the field study). They were followed by Arequipa (training provided in April of 1997, 13 months before the field study), Pucallpa (training provided in July of 1997, 10 months before the field study), and finally Puno (training provided in November of 1997, 6 months before the field study).

It was also possible to confirm, through the final course evaluations, that almost all of the community leaders gave a very positive evaluation of the training program. Some made suggestions for improving the program (recommending, for example: more time for the training program, greater emphasis on certain themes of personal interest). The pre- and post-test data confirmed that there was a significant increase in knowledge of human rights among those trained.

The reports that representatives from each department brought to the first annual meeting of community leaders in Lima in February, 1998 made it possible to appreciate a wide variety of applications of what they learned from the training program once they returned to their communities:^{25 26}

²⁵ Most of these data were obtained in December 1997, five months before carrying out the field study. The reports include information from many, although not, all of the community leaders in each department since some work in very isolated areas and were not able to attend the annual evaluation where these data were pulled together and summarized. For this reason, the numbers that appear in the text are under-estimated.

²⁶ It is possible, from the reports, to obtain data on magnitude and occurrence of different applications. However, it is not possible to comment on the quality of the applications.

- ***Training through courses and workshops.*** The leaders had developed training courses and workshops of 1 to 3 days (some doing an exact replica of the training they received from IPEDEHP; others offering shorter courses or using the materials in different workshops). Together they had trained over 5,400 people focusing on the following themes: human rights, democracy, women's rights, children's rights, self-esteem, citizen participation.
- ***Dissemination through short presentations:*** The leaders gave presentations of 1 to 3 hours to over 14,600 people, touching on themes such as: women's rights, violence against women, family violence, rights of children and adolescents, child abuse, democracy, citizen participation, self-esteem.
- ***Establishment of Human Rights Committees and Offices for the Defense of Children, Adolescents & Women (DEMUNAS):*** The community leaders established Human Rights Committees in Moyobamba, Rioja, Puno, Ucayali, and Aguaytía and DEMUNAS in Picota, Arequipa and Ucayali.
- ***Radio and television programs:*** Community leaders in three of the four departments reported that they had organized and/or participated in radio and television programs that touched on the following themes: human rights, children's rights, women's rights, the rights of indigenous people, and democracy.
- ***Other activities:*** Community leaders in three departments reported that they had organized/participated in other activities in their communities that had as a principal objective promoting human rights and democracy. Among these activities: a post-graduate course in human rights at a university, campaigns and marches, children's theater, literary competitions.

PROFILE OF THE 20 PEOPLE SELECTED TO PARTICIPATE IN THE FIELD STUDY

Based on the criteria used to select the sample (gender, region, size of community):

- Eleven were women and 9 men.
- Eight live in the highlands (Puno and Arequipa) and 12 in the jungles (San Martín and Pucallpa); seventeen (Puno, San Martín, Pucallpa) lived in zones previously affected by the violence.
- Three live in a city of approximately 500,000 inhabitants, 6 in cities with approximately 100,000 inhabitants; 7 in cities of between 35,000 and 50,000 inhabitants, and 4 in small towns of between 5,000 and 8,000 inhabitants.

Additional characteristics of the sample, based on the other variables used in the analysis (age, education level, occupation):

- Age: between 23 and 55 years old, with an average of 36 years of age ²⁷.

²⁷ 6 between 20 and 29 years, 6 between 30 and 39 years, 5 between 40 and 49 years, 3 between 50 and 55 years.

- Education: 3 have not completed primary school, 4 have completed secondary school, 4 are studying at the university level, 8 have finished university, and one has a post-graduate degree.
- Occupation: one person works in artisanry/agriculture, one works in a community kitchen for child workers, one is an alderman in her municipality, one is a secretary, there is a psychologist, a lawyer, an adult educator, two primary teachers, one secondary teacher, three people who work in mass media (radio, television, magazine), one nurse, two retired teachers, and four housewives.

Slightly over half (11) have had some prior experience in the area of human rights (some work in this area; others had varying levels of knowledge of human rights before attending the course). For the remainder (9) the IPEDHP course provided them with their first exposure to human rights.

Below, to give a little more “flavor” of the sample, are profiles of six of the 20 community leaders:

PROFILES OF SIX OF THE COMMUNITY LEADERS THAT PARTICIPATED IN THE STUDY

- ***An Aymara lady with five years of primary education*** from a small town near the border of Bolivia who directs a women’s artisan’s group; before the course she knew nothing of human rights.
- ***A social worker in Puno*** who is in charge of a human rights education program in one of the Vicarages.²⁸
- ***A secondary school teacher in Arequipa***; before the course he knew little about human rights.
- ***A lawyer from Arequipa*** in charge of a DEMUNA who has worked for many years in human rights.
- ***An indigenous man from the jungles with incomplete university education***, who produces a daily radio program directed toward indigenous people living in isolated areas of the jungle and who had just returned from a 15 day course in human rights sponsored by the Interamerican Institute of Human Rights (IIDH) in San José, Costa Rica.
- ***A municipal government official from a small city in the jungle who is a retired elementary school teacher***. Before the course he knew nothing about human rights.

²⁸ A social action agency of the Catholic church.

INSIGHTS FROM THE FIELD STUDY

This section begins with a box that summarizes the results of the field study. The summary is divided into two sections: (a) data from the field study that confirmed information already known to IPEDEHP and available in their files; and (b) new information that came from the analysis of the field study data.

HIGHLIGHTS OF FIELD STUDY RESULTS

WHAT THE COMMUNITY LEADERS THOUGHT OF/DID WITH THEIR TRAINING

- ***Data that confirm information already known to IPEDEHP and available in their files:***
 - The community leaders really liked the training (interactive methodology, games, dynamics, the trainers).
 - They have applied what they learned in the training in a wide variety of ways (training others, organizing Human Rights Committees and DEMUNAS, radio and television programs, campaigns, and literary and artistic contests).
- ***New information:***
 - *The first thing the community leaders did upon returning to their communities was to play the human rights and democracy games with their families (spouses, children, in-laws, nieces and nephews);*
 - *The commitment to apply what they learned at the training course did not appear to diminish over time;*
 - *Many have invested long hours (some working full time, some as volunteers) in defending and promoting human rights doing a wide variety of things;*
 - *In small communities, where there is no one to go to when one's rights are violated, a number of the community leaders have started (or are in the process of starting) Human Rights Committees or DEMUNAS.*

IMPACTS ON THE LIVES OF THE LEADERS AND THE PEOPLE THEY HAVE TRAINED OR OTHERWISE INFLUENCED

- ***Information that confirms what was already known by IPEDEHP and available in their files:***
 - Many community leaders acquire new knowledge about their rights.
- ***New information:***
 - *Especially among women, an increase in tolerance and self-esteem; for some the IPEDEHP training course was a turning point in their lives;*
 - *Reports of improved communication, tolerance, and understanding between the community leader and members of his/her family;*
 - *The community leaders practice what they learned at the course defending their own rights;*
 - *Upon putting into practice in their communities what they learned at the course, they increment their status as leaders in their communities;*
 - *Less physical violence: reports of reductions in incidence of men beating their wives and parents beating their children;*
 - *Similar results for individuals trained by the community leaders: increases in knowledge of one's rights, less physical abuse from spouses and of children; increase in self-esteem among women.*

The sections that follow provide more detailed information on the results of the field study.²⁹

1. WHAT THE COMMUNITY LEADERS THOUGHT OF THE TRAINING COURSE

Nineteen of the 20 community leaders interviewed indicated that they really liked the training. The only exception was a gentleman that produced a television program who, while he liked a number of aspects of the program, found it a little superficial. Several volunteered that there was something for everybody in the course. When they describe the course many use the following words to characterize the atmosphere created in the course: “friendship”, “trust”, “unity”, “commitment”.

Three themes stood out in the interviews:

- ***Participatory methodology.*** A strong majority (15 of 20 cases) indicated that they really liked the games and dynamics—the way they force people to participate and encourage them to share their own experiences in order to arrive at joint conclusions. For the majority this methodology was entirely new.
- ***The heterogeneity of the participants.*** This was seen by the participants as one of the strengths of the training course. For some, the heterogeneity provided an opportunity to learn from/share with people who came from different backgrounds. For people with higher levels of education, the training course provided an opportunity to get to know people with less education and to appreciate how much these individuals contribute to the training program. For participants with lesser education this heterogeneity provided them with an opportunity to relate to individuals who have had more opportunities in life and to realize that they are respected by these individuals.
- ***The skills of the trainers.*** Twelve community leaders pointed to the credibility of the trainers, their way of relating to the community leaders in such a way as to make each person feel that they were a valuable contribution to the training course, their “cariño”.

The box below provides some testimonies from the community leaders about the training they received that illustrate the observations provided above:

²⁹ I used the six variables listed above to analyze the data collected from the field. As we will see later in this chapter, there were differences with relationship to two variables—gender and size of community. I did not find differences with relation to the other variables (age, education, region, occupation).

SOME TESTIMONIES ON THE TRAINING PROVIDED BY IPEDEHP

- ***A single Aymara women from a small town near the border of Bolivia who reached fifth grade:***
“They came from different places. I was the only one wearing a pollera.³⁰ There was a lawyer, an engineer, others. I was uncomfortable at the beginning, but as the workshop continued I lost my fear. I like the variety of people at the workshop. It’s necessary to enter into an area that is not yours to lose fear, to be a leader. There were people from other institutions, other languages. It was interesting to be with Quechua people. We could exchange experiences.”
- ***A sociologist who is a teacher in a secondary school in a large city:*** *“The workshop was a novelty. It made us participate directly, form our own concepts. The teachers weren’t the only ones that talked. We all talked. A heterogeneous and dynamic group. I could see the common people, see that they understood what democracy is. It made us become more sensitive to others.”*
- ***A young man, himself formerly a child laborer, working in a dining room for child laborers:***
“Before I went to training courses to listen, as an observer. In the IPEDEHP course the experience was totally different. We danced, we learned playing games, we sang. You don’t want to sleep or go to the bathroom...Every day I got up earlier in order to go to the course. I met people of such high quality at the course: mayors and aldermen. We spoke about the country’s problems and we came up with solutions. When I see that there are others that are concerned I have hope that our country can change.”
- ***A woman living in the jungle, alderman in a municipality of 30,000 people who is working on her university degree in pedagogy:*** *“I knew nothing about human rights before the course. The course was a revelation. I learned a great deal. There were new dynamics that had to do with one’s feelings. The trainers were contagious—their emotiveness, their desire to work. The materials are very good. The “carpeta” is super practical, easy to understand. The games are related to our daily lives.”*
- ***A retired teacher who had also been a high level official in his community of 39,000 people:*** *“I loved the course....the way of working was entirely new to me. It provided us an opportunity to analyze our own problems in a way that we hadn’t looked at them before. It aroused our curiosity. It motivated us to do investigations in our own communities on the status of human rights. We learned about our rights. We committed ourselves to do something similar”.*
- ***A university student:*** *“We were left with the need to apply what we learned.”*

2. HOW THEY APPLIED WHAT THEY LEARNED AT THE TRAINING COURSE

From the data collected in the field it is possible to make a variety of observations about how the community leaders applied what they learned at the IPEDEHP training course:

- ***The first thing that most of the community leaders did upon returning to their communities was share what they learned with their families.*** In 11 of 13 cases, the community leaders played the games with their spouses and children when they returned to their homes. And not just once but several times. One community leader told me that her 11 year old daughter was so fascinated with the games that she has played them many times and memorized all the cards. Another told me that her children who are 8 and 10 years old play

³⁰ The pollera is the traditional dress of indigenous women in the Peruvian highlands. Women wear their hair in braids, a bowler hat, a full skirt with many skirts or petticoats under it, and a shawl.

the game alone when she is not home. When they don't understand the meaning of a word on a card they look it up in the dictionary. Another told me that she plays the game on Sundays with her children who are 8 and 12 years old and with her husband. Her in-laws and her sister also come over on Sundays to play with them.

In another instance, described below by the husband of one of the community leaders trained by IPEDEHP, the community leader who returned from the course also played the games with her neighbors: *"She brought the materials from the course. They looked like they were games for children. But it wasn't that way. One learns through playing. We played the games with our neighbors. Some had questions. My wife helped us to understand the game and its significance. Our neighbors now know that if they have problems in the future they can go to my wife in order to learn what institutions they should go to. Our neighbors now comment that there is something to learn in my house."*

- ***All dedicate most of their efforts to sharing and defending the rights of women and children as well as the themes of self esteem and family violence.*** In the communities that I visited there are still wounds from the violence of prior years (people who have disappeared and/or who have been tortured). These wounds continue to be manifested in: people who are psychology traumatized (many lost family members, several were detained and interrogated); people who are in a financially precarious position, especially in the zones where coca was grown given that family incomes have dropped tremendously now that they can't sell coca. A number of the individuals I interviewed commented that these wounds had been translated into, among others, increases in family violence: men beating their wives, parents beating their children.³¹
- ***Many do not limit themselves to only doing training:*** Eight of the community leaders told me that, after the training course, they organized and participated in radio and television programs where human rights was the principal focus. Two community leaders--one who has a daily radio program, and another who has a weekly television program--told me that after the course they set aside special time in their programs devoted to human rights. Twelve of the 20 community leaders told me that they had organized and/or participated in human rights campaigns in their communities. Five wanted to open a shelter for abused women and children. All told me that, since the course, they have been providing advice to their friends and neighbors on how to defend their rights.

One indigenous woman from the jungle commented on the case of a person who came to her house for advice: *"Three days ago a young woman came to me to ask for advice on what to do. She had separated from her husband and he had taken their children. I advised her to go*

³¹ Some community leaders have become involved in defending civil and political rights, which has resulted in their gaining a high profile in their communities. Two women, one with five years of primary education and the other with a complete secondary education, established a Human Rights Committee in the office of the Prefect of their community of 50,000 not long after returning from the IPEDEHP training where they offer their services free of charge. Since this is a zone in the jungle that is still recuperating from years of violence (both on the part of the narco-traffickers and the MRTA), they have assisted with the cases of some very humble people unjustly incarcerated for being suspected of being members of the MRTA or of having been accused by their neighbors of growing coca on their properties.

to him to persuade him to pay for their food. Now that lady has all her children back and he pays for their food. He has repented and wants to return to her. I feel content. I have been able to reunite them. I also have not stayed behind. Since a year ago my husband, who separated from me, is now paying for our children's food. The course gave me the courage to ask him to pay for our children's food."

- ***In small towns and cities where there is nobody to go to when one's rights are violated, the community leaders have filled the gap establishing Human Rights Committees or DEMUNAS.*** Five community leaders (two in a city of 50,000 inhabitants in the jungles, three in another city of 35,000 inhabitants in the same region) have established Human Rights Committees—one in the office of the Prefect and another in the house of two of the community leaders. Four others (two from towns of less than 5,000 inhabitants) are in the process of establishing a Human Rights Committee. One (an alderman in her municipality of 30,000 people) has been able to establish four DEMUNAS: one in the municipal headquarters which is a town of some 5,000 people, the others in small communities in the municipality.
- ***It would appear that the commitment is maintained over time.*** In the Department of San Martin, where the community leaders had received training from IPEDEHP 23 months before this field study was carried out, enthusiasm for applying what they learned at the course remains high. Two women remain very active with the Human Rights Committee they established and they want to open a shelter for abused women and children. Three community leaders in another small city remain active with their Human Rights Committee. They also want to open a shelter for abused women and children. The alderman of another municipality is busy creating more DEMUNAS. In addition, she continues to insert the theme of human rights in all training supported by the municipality, for example, a sewing course.
- ***Among the community leaders there is a great deal of creativity in looking for resources that permit them to continue their work to support human rights and democracy.*** Two women work in the local market and do ironing on weekends in order to obtain money to travel to nearby communities in order to help people defend their rights. Several community leaders have been able to obtain donations (materials, money) from local businesses in order to carry out training courses. Almost all have been able to obtain, free of charge, sites (churches, facilities of local NGOs) for delivering their training courses.
- ***Nevertheless, all complain of economic limitations and the lack of IPEDEHP materials that would make their multiplier task more effective.*** Several told me that, if they had funding for transportation, they would have carried out many more training courses outside of their communities. Others indicated that they lacked the necessary materials (games, carpetas) to provide to the individuals who they had, in turn, trained to be community promoters after they returned from the IPEDEHP program.
- ***At the beginning, some had difficulty gaining acceptance in their communities and others in their workplace.*** Two community leaders, when they attempted to defend the rights of people who had been unjustly jailed, were threatened by the police who told them that surely they must be terrorist sympathizers and deserved to be jailed. They were, however, able to convince the policemen of the legitimacy and importance of their work. They now visit jailed people in their community with regularity, in order to train them in their rights.

Another community leader, who works in the municipality in her city, had difficulties applying what she learned in her workplace and in her community when she returned from the IPEDEHP training. She resolved her dilemma by working in a nearby town an hour away where she collaborates with another leader who took the IPEDEHP training. She told me that this has given good results.

A professor trained by a community leader in a secondary school in a large city indicated that he had difficulty applying what he learned in his classroom given that he teaches math. However, as with the community leader referred to above, he has found a solution: a couple times a year over the weekend he and another professor who received the training do workshops in human rights and democracy for students in their highschool and other highschools in the city.

Yet another professor, who also had difficulties applying what he learned from the course at his school—especially with parents—has resolved his problem by visiting parents and other members of the community in their homes where he gives them short presentations on human rights and democracy.

The box below provides some examples of what the community leaders have done with their training:

SOME EXAMPLES OF WHAT THE COMMUNITY LEADERS DID WITH THEIR TRAINING

- ***A lawyer who heads a DEMUNA in a large city who took the course a year ago:***
 - played the games with her daughters;
 - has done eight complete replicas of the course;
 - participates in a weekly radio program on human rights;
 - has organized and participated in several human rights campaigns;
 - has given many short presentations on human rights;
 - started an “Escuela de Padres” (School for Parents) where human rights is a key theme.
- ***Two housewives (one with 5 years of primary education, the other complete secondary education) from a small city who took the course two years ago*** work on a voluntary basis full time disseminating what they learned and have gained respect in their community for their efforts. They:
 - played the games with their children;
 - trained 45 human rights promoters in their community;
 - established a Human Rights Committee that attends 15 cases a day, three days a week;
 - visit communities to listen to complaints and counsel people on their rights;
 - visit prisoners in jail to counsel them on their rights;
 - have been sought out by town legal authorities to corroborate possible rights violations of the poor;
 - give short presentations on human rights;
 - appear on radio and TV programs to raise human rights issues;
 - are, at the request of the Director and teachers at their children’s elementary school, training them in human rights;
 - want to open a shelter for battered women and children.
- ***Three individuals from a small city (a retired teacher who was Deputy Prefect in his town, his wife with secondary education, a women with five years primary education) who also took the course two years ago:***
 - played the games with their children;
 - gave a replica of the course for presidents of women’s clubs in their community;
 - with the presidents formed a Human Rights Committee which operates out of the home of the teacher and his wife;
 - offer short presentations on human rights through the women’s clubs;
 - want to open a shelter for battered women and children
- ***A young man from a community in Arequipa, who has been very active in social outreach activities with his church:***
 - has replicated the training course he took twice, with young people in his parish;.
 - at the time of the interview was collaborating with five of the graduates of this course to help them organize similar courses in their communities.

3. THE IMPACT OF THE TRAINING PROGRAM ON THE COMMUNITY LEADERS THEMSELVES

In a number of cases (not all) it would appear that this program—which includes a training course of three days plus follow up done both by IPEDHP and its counterparts at the community level—has had a direct impact on the community leaders, their families, and the people with whom they interacted in their communities upon returning from training. The impact

appeared to be stronger among women, both those trained by IPEDEHP and those that IPEDEHP graduates, in turn, trained.

- ***For the majority of the community leaders interviewed, their participation in the program has permitted them to acquire new knowledge--of human rights and democracy as well as interactive training methodologies:*** (13 of 20 cases) A social worker from one of the Vicarages in Puno had the following to say: *“I learned new techniques—of presentation, motivation, relaxation, reflection. It helps give me tools to get closer to the people I train. One can also take these techniques and adapt them for use in other areas such as leadership and organizational development. I have adapted the cards from the human rights game to the themes of women’s rights, children’s rights, and adolescent’s rights .”*
- ***Some, especially women, indicated that their participation in the program gave them an opportunity to learn to listen better to others, to acquire humility and tolerance:*** (6 of 20 cases, 5 of 11 women, 1 of 9 men). A 42 year old lawyer who is in charge of a DEMUNA observed: *“I have come out of the training feeling small. I feel useful but impotent to satisfy everyone. I now understand the need to listen to what others have to say so that I can learn from them. Before, when I gave training courses in human rights, I had a tendency to lecture and the participants got bored.”.*

A 28 year old social worker expressed the following: *“On a personal level the course helped me to continue changing my attitudes. At times in the past I expected too much of other people and became impatient with them. When one speaks of human rights one speaks of a sense of being human—seeing others with their limitations, their deficiencies, their virtues. As a result of the training course I am more tolerant and open.”*

- ***An increase in self-esteem/self-confidence, especially among women who participated in the training course:*** (11 of 20 cases - 9 of 11 women, 2 of 9 men). In the words of the same social worker: *“Nobody loves what they don’t know, or gives what they don’t have...I now am more concerned about myself. My colleagues and my brothers see me differently and value my work. I value what I do. I know that I have leadership qualities. When people come to interview me, I know that they listen to what I have to say. If I value myself, respect myself, I can be more effective in my work.”.*

A campesina women who has five years of primary education said: *“I felt different after the training course. It was as though I had evaluated myself. I saw that in some areas I was making errors. My self-esteem increased and I have gained many things. I learned new rights—of women, of children. There are many abandoned women who can’t defend themselves The law says one thing, the judges something else. One has to know one’s rights in order to defend oneself.”*

A young man who is 22 years old, who used to be a child laborer and now works in a dining room for child laborers, feels that there was also a change in his self-esteem as a result of attending the course: *“The training course has left me charged. I try to share with others what I learned—women, children, foreigners. I have a better awareness now of reality. Of course my self-esteem went up. I don’t know if it is due to the training course or an accumulation of other things. Politics in my country is quite dirty. We can’t continue watching what is happening without doing anything. Now that the municipal elections are*

coming up I should participate in a political party. I am now more capable of contributing to the solution of the problems in my community. Why not? It's time."

- ***In some cases, the participants report that the training had a profound impact on their lives*** (5 women). A woman who completed high school and who lives in a small city in the jungles observed: *"My life changed completely. In my home I learned to value myself as a woman. My self-esteem went up. I learned how to maintain equality in my house. I was able to achieve better dialogue with my husband. The Maria of before tended to be angry, was proud, impatient, wanted to do more than her husband, was machista with her children, did not have her self-esteem well placed. The Maria of today has overcome machismo and pride, she is more patient with her children and her husband, she thinks more of her children's future, she understands that it is thanks to the efforts of her husband that she can work as a volunteer in human rights."*

Many people admire us, even though we are humble they respect us because they know we concern ourselves with other people's problems. When you don't have your self-esteem well placed you grow up in fear, you cannot face problems. Acquiring self-esteem one can dialogue with others. Without self-esteem we are not capable of dialoging, listening. I have learned to like myself."

A priest in charge of one of the vicarages that served as IPEDEHP's counterpart when it gave a course in his region had the following to say: *"The course touches the heart. It gives them (especially women) something new in their lives. It is an opening. It puts on the table the hidden values—equality, respect, dignity, self-esteem. It is like a conversion to human rights."*

Another priest who has accompanied IPEDEHP since it was founded in 1985, had a similar comment but with a different twist: *"It is a conversion to one's self. One of the serious problems with our current society is that people who are poor and marginalized have the tendency to internalize the prejudices that others from the outside have of them. The IPEDEHP training course returns you to yourself. It is precisely because it returns you to yourself that you can open to others in another way".*

- ***Some community leaders have put what they learned at the course into practice defending their own rights.*** A lady from a rural area in the highlands, who has five years of primary education, gave three examples:

"The course helped me a great deal in gaining custody of my daughter. Before I didn't know what the law said. After taking the course, I knew how to ask the right questions. One day after the course the father of my daughter came to take her away. I said 'What law permits you to take away my daughter?' I went to a lawyer. The lawyer said that children have the right to their nationality. He also said that single mothers have the right to be respected. The same for their daughters. He did not charge me for the consultation. The lawyer asked me, 'How do you know your rights? Are you studying law?' I felt like I knew everything. I won custody of my daughter."

When I went to school the teacher hit me. I didn't know my rights. Now teachers don't do that. Last year my daughter, who was in second grade, wasn't learning anything. I thought at the beginning it was my daughter's fault, but then I came to the conclusion that the

teacher wasn't doing a good job of teaching. I went to the school to talk to her. I said, 'Miss, I see there is no learning taking place in second grade'. The teacher responded that the children didn't understand what she was teaching them. I said, 'As the teacher you have to help them understand'. The teacher then said she would do her best to make up for lost time. But it was almost the end of the school year. I said to the teacher, 'Nobody learns something from one night to the next day. You need to become a better teacher'. The teacher wasn't very pleased with me.

On another occasion I had a situation in which a man who was drunk defamed my honor. He came to my house and was very rude. I said 'This time I will pardon you.' However, he returned another time and said things that weren't nice. I went to the judge and they put him in jail for two days. His wife came to me to ask why I had gone to the judge and I explained, 'I might be single but I have my honor'. When he got out of jail the man came to complain that I had put him in jail and his wife defended him. Later the wife came to visit me and began to cry. She said she was going to leave him. I counseled her to talk with him. Now things are better between them."

- ***Finally, for most community leaders what they learned at the training course has permitted them to increase their stature in their communities.*** After receiving the training course and applying what they learned in their communities, the leaders begin to become identified as authorities in the area of human rights. People come to them for counsel. This permits them to feel important and needed by their neighbors. The same campesina woman who is quoted above said the following *"Many women come to me for advice. They think I know everything. 'I don't know anything', I tell them. 'I receive advice from Puno'. I now feel stronger as a leader."*

4. CHANGES IN THE FAMILIES OF THE COMMUNITY LEADERS

When a training program—such as that provided to community leaders by IPEDEHP—affects one's own values and it does it not just by affecting one's intellect but also one's feelings, it is not surprising that it can have a strong impact, especially within the families of the people it trains.

Some examples of these impacts are provided below:

- ***In the case of some of the women, a change in their relation with their husbands.*** Five women that I interviewed informed me that the training course provided them with an opportunity to learn their own rights as women. Several admitted that, before the training course, they didn't know that they had the same rights as their husbands. Upon returning from the training course, some told me that they began to openly demand their right to be treated equal. They didn't tolerate any more physical abuse. They left their houses to give training courses and to attend meetings on human rights and democracy, something that they had never done before. They insisted that their husbands participate in household chores, again something they had never done before. Some of the same women indicated that, as a result of the training, they realized they were treating their husbands in a "machistic" fashion.

In some cases the women reported that their husbands supported them when they returned to from the IPEDEHP training. In others the reaction was very negative. One community

leader told me that, after a few months that were quite difficult (her husband threw her out of the house at the beginning), she and her husband have reconciliated. In an interview jointly with her and her husband they indicated that, as a result of the experience, they now had a better marriage and that there was more respect between them. In another case, the differences could not be resolved and the couple decided to separate.³²

- ***The children indicate that they have applied, at their school and with their friends, what they learned from their parent who attended the IPEDEHP course.*** (7 of 10 cases in school; 4 of 10 cases with their friends). One community leader reported that, after she had advised her children of their rights, her kids put up a rebellion. They demanded that their father participate in house hold chores. They demanded that their grandparents treat them as equals. Some children, during their interviews with me, told me that, as a result of what they had learned, they are now giving counsel to their friends.

Many have shared what they learned about their rights at their schools, with their classmates and their teachers. As a consequence, in two cases the teachers have approached the parent who received training to ask if the parent would provide training in human rights to the teacher, other teachers in the school, and the school director.

- ***In some places the spouses/older children have applied what they learned from the spouse or parent at their work place or in their communities:*** A secondary teacher, upon returning to his home, began to play the games with his wife and children. He told me that his wife, who is a director of a primary school, was so fascinated with what she learned that she asked her husband to help her develop a course for the teachers in her school.

A naturalist doctor who is the spouse of a community leader told me that, as a result of what he learned from his wife, he now shares information on human rights with his patients. He also sends patients to his wife, who directs a Human Rights Committee in his city, for help.

Another lady, upon returning from the training course, shared the materials and played the games with her three older children—a teacher, a nurse, and a university student. They were so interested that they asked for materials so that they could take them to their work places and communities in order to do workshops.

- ***In several places, the graduates of the course reported that, as a result of the training they received, they have become more communicative and respectful in their interaction with their families, more tolerant, and more loving.*** (10 of 18 cases - 8 of 11 women, 2 of 7 men). I was able to confirm this in some (although not all) interviews with family members. A woman with five years of primary education had the following to say: “*The Rosa (fictitious name) of yesterday was egotistical, authoritarian with her children, ‘machista’. I should I was the only person that existed. I never valued my husband. Today I am another person. I have confidence with my husband and children as if we were brothers and sisters. We are all equal.*”

³² While the reports of the community leaders are positive, it is not possible to attribute the changes only to the training provided by IPEDEHP. It is possible that there have been other factors, outside of the training, that have influenced them. In some cases it is possible that what they learned at the IPEDEHP course stimulated them to acquire other skills/tools to deal with spousal abuse.

A lawyer from a large city observed: *“The course has also helped me to understand my daughters better, to appreciate that they are human. I am more tolerant with them.”*

5. **CHANGES IN PEOPLE TRAINED BY THE COMMUNITY LEADERS**

It was harder to identify impacts at the level of individuals trained by the leaders, mainly because there was less time to talk with them and to thus establish a sense of openness and trust. This is an area that would need further study.

Nevertheless, I do have among the data I collected several manifestations of changes in individuals after they were trained by the community leader. These changes are very similar to those reported by the community leaders themselves.

- ***What I heard most was that these individuals had acquired new knowledge on human rights. Several also reported a change in their relationship with their spouse.*** Several women indicated that, as a result of the training they received, they realized they had the same rights as their husbands and that they now demanded that these rights be respected.
- ***Some reported that, as a result of the training they received, they had changed in the way they treated their children.*** They don't hit them any more. Before they thought that physical punishment was the correct thing to do because this is the way they were raised. However, they have now changed their opinion.
- ***Several people reported changes in their own self-esteem.*** The effect is similar to that produced in the community leaders as a result of attending the IPEDEHP training course.

The box below contains some testimonies of individuals trained by the community leaders on what they thought of the training and the impact it had on them as individuals.

TESTIMONIES OF INDIVIDUALS TRAINED BY THE SOCIAL LEADERS REGARDING THE TRAINING THEY RECEIVED AND ITS IMPACT ON THEM

- **An illiterate Quechua woman from the highlands who has been abandoned by her husband:** “My husband used to hit me. He didn’t bring me food. Now he doesn’t hit me. He came to hit me but I said no.”
- **The president of a women’s club in the jungle with incomplete secondary education who, after receiving training from the social leaders, became a member of the Human Rights Committee in her community:** “It was something new. Before we didn’t know anything about our rights. We suffered personal and social abuses. The course dynamics helped us to relate to one another. We became closer, we trust one another. At the end I felt different, more motivated. I felt more protected as I knew how to defend my rights. I told my husband about what I had learned in the course and he didn’t like it. At the beginning he didn’t want me to go to the Human Rights Committee meetings, but I didn’t stop going. I always speak of our rights. Little by little he is changing. We no longer hit our children. We speak to them as equals.”
- **An indigenous woman from the jungle with five years of primary education:** “I learned to defend my rights with my husband. I have been abused by my husband. Now I hardly experience either physical or psychological abuse. Where there is communication there is understanding. Before I did not know that my children had rights. I know that I must counsel them. As a woman, I now know that we can’t do anything if we sit back. We have to leave our houses.”
- **A young man of 17, in his last year of secondary school, who participated in a training course in human rights organized by his professor who attended the IPEDEHP training course:** “I learned how to defend people exploited by the government. I learned how we are discriminated against, how we don’t know what the laws are. I learned to defend my own rights and those of others. In my neighborhood there is a construction firm across the street from my house. The owner didn’t want to pay his employees. I spoke with his son. I asked him, ‘Why is your father discriminating against them?’ The son spoke with his father and the next day the father paid his employees.”

6. CHANGES AT THE COMMUNITY LEVEL

Since I had neither the time nor the resources to do a more in depth study regarding impacts at the community level, I had to limit myself to reports from leaders and others in the communities that I interviewed regarding their perceptions of changes in the community as a result of the work that the IPEDEHP trained community leaders had done in their communities. Given the importance of this theme, I highly recommend a specific study focusing on this topic.

Listed below are some impressions based on opinions that I received from the community leaders and others that I interviewed in their communities:

- **People more conscious of their rights.** This was a constant theme in the interviews I carried out with the community leaders and the people they trained. There is no doubt that the community leaders, as a result of the work they are doing, have helped others in their communities to gain a better awareness of what their rights are.

- ***People know where they can go to be assisted when their rights are violated.*** This theme came up constantly in the interviews. The IPEDEHP training course serves to inform participants what their rights are. The “carpeta” also has very practical information on the institutions and offices they can go to when their rights are violated and they need assistance.
- ***More women defending their rights.*** Over and over women (community leaders trained by IPEDEHP, women trained by the community leaders) told me with great pride of their successes in defending their rights as a result of having received the training. In two places (two women with five years of primary education) I was told that the lawyers they had approached when they had questions about their rights asked if they were studying law.
- ***Fewer cases of violence against women.*** This is hard to confirm since there are many cases of family violence that are never reported. However, I was informed in a number of interviews that, as a result of the efforts of the community leaders upon returning to their communities after being trained, the incidence of violence against women had gone down in their communities.
- ***Innocent people released from jail.*** Two women living in the jungle who run a Human Rights Committee in their community have been able during the last year to get five people out of jail—one unjustly accused of being a terrorist, two unjustly accused of growing coca on their properties, one unjustly accused of sexually assaulting another person, and a girl who was put in jail with no specific charges.
- ***Reduction in complaints among students of being poorly treated by their professors.*** A secondary school teacher, now the director of his school, told me that, before he attended the IPEDEHP course the school received on average 20 complaints a month from students regarding maltreatment from professors. A few months after returning from the course and having trained the other teachers in the school as well as the students on their rights, complaints of mistreatment had gone down to an average of 2 per month.
- ***Development of the ability, with success, to confront local authorities who were violating their rights.*** A community leader from Ayacucho, who heads a campesino group, trained other campesino leaders in his zone on their rights when he returned from the IPEDEHP course. At this time, all were being mistreated by the local military authorities who controlled the zone following the period of strong Shining Path presence. Armed with their training certificates, plus the materials they had received from IPEDEHP, they went as a group to the military leadership. They told the military authorities that, based on the provisions of the Peruvian Constitution, they had certain rights and that they could not be treated the way the military were treating them. According to the campesino leader and a recognized intellectual in the zone, upon hearing what the campesino leaders had to say, the military stopped bothering them.
- ***Establishment of good relations with local authorities, increasing possibilities for cooperation in people’s defense when their are rights violations.*** A number of the graduates of the IPEDEHP training course—and not necessarily people with high levels of education or professional formation—have managed to establish excellent relations with authorities in their communities. This permits them, when they have rights violations, to seek out the corresponding authorities for assistance, with the assurance that they will be attended.

The District Attorney of a town in the jungle where the community leaders trained by IPEDEHP established a Human Rights Committee observed the following about the two community leaders: *“They play an important role. They are the linkage between people of a low level of culture and ourselves. The community leaders identify with them, they get out to their small communities. These ladies, in a totally disinterested fashion, bring the concerns of these individuals to our attention. They do not abandon unjust cases. They tell the truth. It is very helpful to have them as allies.”*

CHAPTER VIII

LESSONS LEARNED FROM THE IPEDEHP EXPERIENCE

This study presents an experience carried out in one country, with a specific history and context. This chapter attempts to address two related questions: Can this experience be reproduced only in a similar context or are we talking about a methodology that, with adaptations, can be applied elsewhere? If the answer is the latter, then what are the lessons learned for others wishing to learn from the IPEDEHP experience and possibly adapt it to their specific country contexts?

A first response is that IPEDEHP as an institution cannot be replicated in its entirety. It was born and it developed under very special circumstances during a historical period in Peru that has its own peculiarities.

However, the experience shows that the methodology that IPEDEHP has perfected over the years can be applied elsewhere, especially in locations similar to those where the 20 community leaders live (cities of between 50,000 and 500,000 inhabitants; smaller towns and cities of between 5,000 and 30,000 inhabitants). After the initial training the community leaders have a basic knowledge of human rights and democracy. They also have valuable experience in learning and applying interactive training methodologies. Many also leave the course highly motivated and committed to apply what they have learned in their communities. This, united with the easy to apply materials that they are given at the course, helps to assure a successful application of what they learned once they return to their communities.

Although the experiences and realities of the community leaders are diverse, the study demonstrates that the community leaders are reproducing with creativity the methodology they learned from IPEDEHP. It doesn't seem to matter what regions the leaders are from, their gender, their education level, or the size of the town or the city they live in.

One cannot affirm that all are carrying out the multiplier effect with 100% success. Nevertheless, from the information provided during the field study by individuals who were trained by the community leaders³³--especially that which refers to changes in these individuals which are similar to those achieved in the IPEDEHP training--it would appear that a number are successfully replicating the methodology.

Presented below are the elements of IPEDEHP's strategy that have contributed to its effectiveness and that can be applied by other groups that have similar objectives. Also listed are the challenges that IPEDEHP has encountered along the way (some of which are ongoing) and which could be encountered by other groups doing similar work. Questions emerge from each challenge that invite reflection-- for IPEDEHP itself as well as other institutions, groups or individuals that do similar work.

³³ It would have been ideal to observe some of the training courses given by the community leaders in their communities. However, due to limitations in time I was unable to do so.

ELEMENTS OF IPEDEHP'S STRATEGY THAT HAVE CONTRIBUTED TO ITS EFFECTIVENESS.

1. IPEDEHP is an organization that has a clear philosophy, vision and values and an agreeable work atmosphere.

IPEDEHP is made up of a group with a high level of professional capability. These individuals work as a team, they learn from one another, and are oriented by a common conceptual framework and common values. This clarity in vision and values is fundamental for the success of their work. It permits them to have differences of opinion. It also permits them to survive the interpersonal tensions that arise in all organizations.

One of the members of the team, who joined IPEDEHP in 1987, says it very well: *"It is contagious. We are clear on our objectives. There is a strong emotional commitment /empathy with these objectives. They are not distanced from our daily lives. In carrying out IPEDEHP's objectives we have an opportunity to satisfy our dreams. I have a space to do what I love to do. I can develop my creativity. We have created along the way".* This person also commented *"We get along well. We have learned to work as a team. One person can't do it all."*

2. IPEDEHP's training program for community leaders in "Human Rights, Democracy, and Citizen Participation" is an excellent example of good training.

For all the individuals who were interviewed, with the exception of one who gave a positive but less enthusiastic response, the training was an excellent experience. The comments I received from NGOs working in human rights within and outside of Peru were also very positive. The components of IPEDEHP's training methodology—some of their own creation, others adapted from other experiences—concur with what the literature on popular education signals as the fundamental elements for effective training.³⁴ These components are listed below.

³⁴ Claude, Richard Pierre. *Methodologies for Human Rights Education*. Unpublished manuscript to be included in the World Report on Human Rights to be published in 1999 by the People's Decade of Human Rights Education.

IPEDEHP: ELEMENTS OF GOOD TRAINING

- ***A relationship is established between the theoretical and the practical.*** This is not a theoretical course with an academic orientation. Instead theory and practice are developed simultaneously. The title of the training course summarizes the approach very well: “*You Have Rights: Know them, Promote them, Defend them*”.
- ***A comprehensive strategy that includes: the development of agreements with local counterparts, the selection of community leaders, their participation in the training course, and continuous follow-up after the training course.*** This is not an isolated three day training course, lacking prior preparation and follow up. The selection of leaders who are known and respected in their communities is fundamental. They come highly motivated to learn and to apply what they have learned once they return to their communities. In addition, there are a variety of mechanisms for follow-up and feedback once the graduates return to their communities, something that is not often seen in training programs.
- ***From the time the training course begins, emphasis is placed on living what one learns, using as a point of departure the participants’ daily experiences.*** The training is built on the day to day life experiences of the participants. They leave ready to apply what they have learned in their communities.
- ***A highly participatory methodology.*** The participants learn by playing doing role plays, working in small discussion groups. There is hardly a moment when they are sitting listening to someone lecture. The participants love this methodology
- ***The training has a therapeutic focus.*** An atmosphere is created which permits the participants to share their feelings, fears, and hopes related to the theme of human rights. Keeping in mind that many of the leaders have been either directly or indirectly victims of the violence of the preceding years, this is fundamental.
- ***The participants begin by looking at themselves, to then be able to project outside.*** The emphasis on the affective aspect of each person, what they experience through the dynamics and games, are very important parts of the training course.
- ***There is something for everybody.*** For those that had no prior experience in the area of human rights, the training course opened a new world, new concepts. For the “veterans”, the training course provided an opportunity to: (1) explore in more depth what they already knew; (2) update their knowledge; (3) acquire new concepts in an interactive fashion; and (4) meet and get to know other people that they wouldn’t otherwise have had an opportunity to associate with.
- ***The training results in personal commitment.*** Due both to the way in which it applies the affective element and the fact that it bases learning on the participants’ own experiences, by the end of the training course an appreciable number of the community leaders feel obligated to put into practice what they learned because it supports their own self-image and it gives them a sense of the “meaning of life”.
- ***Trainees are encouraged to be creative and to adapt what they learn to the reality of their real life situations.*** The trainers assume that each participant will apply what he/she has learned at the course in accordance with the special characteristics and needs of the communities in which they work.
- ***Democracy and human rights are exemplified in the way the training is conducted.*** The course is a true laboratory of how a group can function in a democratic environment where everyone’s rights are respected.
- ***Excellent trainers.*** The IPEDHEP trainers firmly believe in the philosophy of the institution. They are perceived by the course participants to have a gift for working with people. They are respectful and tolerant. They immediately make the trainees feel comfortable and valued.

3. *Materials, with a strong conceptual base, that are easy to understand and use.*

The “carpetas” that the community leaders take with them to their homes serve as a reference for designing training courses and short talks, programs on human rights for radio and television, defending one’s rights before the authorities. The methodological guide serves as a reference that trainees go to constantly when they design their own training programs and when they want to refresh their memories on how to use the games and dynamics. The games are highly appreciated and used by the leaders when they return to their communities to carry out workshops. They also play them with their families. Many have adapted the cards so that they can play the human rights game in other educational activities that are either directly or indirectly related to human rights. IPEDEHP has also produced other games which are awaiting financing so that they can be edited and used in training courses.

4. *The strength of the training is in the diversity of people who learn from one another.*

By prior agreement with IPEDEHP, the local counterparts make a deliberate effort to select leaders who come from diverse backgrounds. During the training course small heterogeneous groups are organized that include college graduates in education and law along with leaders of campesino and women’s organizations who have not completed primary school. The training is based on the premise that nobody—including the trainers—possesses an absolute knowledge; we are all always learning. The campesino has a lot to teach the lawyer from the city and visa versa. A number of people I interviewed (lawyers, teachers, social workers) told me that they came out of the course with increased humility and an appreciation that they had not had previously of people that belong to other social strata.

5. *IPEDEHP doesn’t attempt to work alone; instead it does everything possible to build on existing networks or to create them if they don’t already exist.*

This is one of the most important lessons learned. IPEDEHP, in everything it does, creates trust networks between organizations and individuals. We have seen, in the case of the training course for community leaders, examples of dynamics and games selected precisely because they build friendships and trust among participants. In the places where IPEDEHP has given courses, there are organizations that already interact with one another—by it through the Peruvian Human Rights Education Network or the National Coordinator on Human Rights.

IPEDEHP receives support from these two networks to: (a) select the best people (leaders) to attend the training courses; and (b) carry out the follow up after the training (channeling materials, organizing periodic evaluation meetings, and in some cases providing financial or other incentives). IPEDEHP has also encouraged the establishment of local networks and a national network for community leaders.

6. *IPEDEHP’s philosophy is to share everything with everybody.*

One of the reasons that its relationships with other organizations are so good is that IPEDEHP does everything to share its materials and methodologies with other organizations. Their philosophy is that each person who comes to them to request assistance be “warmly welcomed”.

7. *IPEDEHP maintains, as an organization, an attitude of constant self-criticism and ongoing learning, both from its successes and its errors.*

The training course for community leaders is the culmination of ten years of experience training teachers in human rights and democracy--ten years of learning and experimenting with different techniques. IPEDEHP's experience with community leaders has also provided an opportunity for learning: IPEDEHP staff are continuously fine tuning aspects of the training course. They have for example, seen the need to provide more in-depth knowledge to the community leaders on topics related to human rights and democracy. Also, through the multiplier effect which has been greater than they anticipated, they have seen the need to provide more educational materials such as games and "carpetas".

8. *Ability to adjust course contents to the changes in the context in which they are working.*

IPEDEHP was born during a period of violence against the population: from the Shining Path, the MRTA, the narco traffickers, the military. They began their work with teachers who were affected by the violence, emphasizing the right to life and offering in their training a process of recovery from the traumas that these people suffered during this period.

As the violence has diminished, IPEDEHP has increasingly concentrated its activities on human rights that are more related to daily life, among them: family violence and concepts related to democracy. IPEDEHP is increasingly being asked to advise other groups whose work focuses on economic and social rights.

CHALLENGES FACED BY IPEDEHP AND BY OTHER GROUPS DOING SIMILAR WORK

What IPEDEHP has accomplished has not been easy. It represents the culmination of 13 years of experience, learning, and adjustments and is the result of constant self-criticism.

There are a number of challenges that IPEDEHP faces that other organizations with similar objectives may face. Some (especially the first), if not resolved, can put IPEDEHP's future existence in jeopardy.

Accompanying most challenges are questions, both for IPEDEHP and other organizations that are applying or want to apply a methodology similar to the one that IPEDEHP uses.

1. *The future sustainability of the institution given that it depends totally on outside sources of financing.*

Since its beginning in 1985, as has been the case with many other NGOs in Peru that work in the area of human rights, IPEDEHP has depended almost totally on outside financing. To date, because of its prestige, IPEDEHP has not had difficulty in obtaining financing. Because they are very clear on who they are and where they want to go, they have always been able to "manage the steering wheel". They have been able to establish their areas of focus. They have also been able to define and develop their strategy for looking for and successfully obtaining financing.

One of the disadvantages of the donations IPEDEHP has received is that they are generally for specific projects with a limited duration. This makes it very difficult for IPEDEHP to give continuity to its activities. There are signs that this is producing frustration among the people and organizations that request training assistance from IPEDEHP. In addition it generates uncertainty among the IPEDEHP staff given that they are always looking for funding to assure the continuity of their projects.

In the case of the program for community leaders, where it is receiving many requests to train new leaders, IPEDEHP currently has financing from USAID which permits it to respond to some of the requests that it receives.

However, some questions emerge:

- What will happen with this program when financing from USAID is over? What steps is IPEDEHP taking to diversify its sources of financing for the community leaders program?
- What will happen if outside donors stop supporting or diminish their support for the elimination of political violence in Peru?
- How will this influence IPEDEHP's program for community leaders as well as IPEDEHP's future as an organization?
- Should IPEDEHP and institutions like it charge for their services in order to assure their future sustainability? If it does, what implications does this have for their philosophical orientation and for the nature of the activities it carries out?

2. *Lack of resources, at the local level, to achieve a multiplier effect in the form and intensity desired by the community leaders*

When IPEDEHP designed its training course for community leaders, its principal experience had been with teachers who mainly limit their multiplier effect to working in their classrooms and in their schools. The IPEDEHP staff never imagined that the community leaders would leave the training course with so much enthusiasm to apply what they learned in their communities. In particular, they had not imagined that many of the community leaders would carry out exact replicas of the training course they received from IPEDEHP and, in so doing, train and prepare other human rights and democracy promoters.

One effect, in several of the communities, is that the leaders are constantly looking for resources to travel to nearby communities to deliver courses and to acquire the materials (pencils, paper, etc.) they need to conduct the courses. Some have obtained resources from IPEDEHP's counterparts in the region and from private businesses. However, there are other leaders--that don't have the capability to generate funds or who work in areas where there is no counterpart willing to make funds available and no businesses willing to offer their collaboration—who are frustrated because they want to achieve a larger multiplier effect but can't.

One problem that all the community leaders have had, and especially those that organize training courses, is a lack of educational materials, especially the "carpetas" and games. Some request and receive additional materials from IPEDEHP. However, due to financial limitations, IPEDEHP cannot respond positively to all requests.

3. *Related to the above, the challenge of providing course graduates with more in depth knowledge.*

As a priest, who is a member of IPEDEHP's General Assembly, observed: IPEDEHP's three day training course is the "*Spark that ignites the motor. You put in the gas along the road*". In only three days the community leaders do not emerge as experts, either in human rights and democracy or in the interactive methodologies. What they do get is a good base in both areas, sufficient to provide training programs in their communities and to carry out other activities (organize marches and campaigns, participate in radio and television programs).

However, as we saw in Chapter VIII, there comes a moment when the community leader wishes to obtain more in depth information--on human rights and democracy and in the use of interactive methodologies--that they can use to give more specialized courses in their communities.

IPEDEHP is very conscious of this need and is taking a variety of steps to provide assistance. IPEDEHP takes advantage of all contacts with the community leaders after the course (three month follow up and the annual evaluation meetings at the departmental level, the annual meeting for representatives of all departments in Lima) to expose course graduates to new knowledge in the area of human rights and democracy as well as new interactive training methodologies. IPEDEHP has also just initiated a newsletter which, in addition to permitting community leaders to share experiences, provides a low cost vehicle for sharing new knowledge and methodologies. In addition IPEDEHP is planning other activities contingent on receiving funding to carry them out. These include: developing courses on more specific themes for community leaders who have already been trained, and producing more "carpetas" and games as well as other materials to facilitate a multiplier effect.

Nevertheless, a question remains outstanding: how can IPEDEHP continue and deepen this follow up when there is no more external financing?

4. *How to assure that the people selected are authentic leaders in their communities and that they commit themselves to a multiplier effect after the training course.*

A critical element to achieving the maximum benefit of IPEDEHP's training is identifying the appropriate leaders and developing a strategy that guarantees their multiplier effect once they return to their communities. In the case of the training program for community leaders, IPEDEHP has established agreements with counterparts at the local and regional level which include clear criteria for selecting the leaders and specific commitments for follow up after the training course.

However, it has not always been possible to assure the achievement of these commitments. In the first months of the program, for example, the Human Rights Commission of the Peruvian Congress acted as a counterpart and took charge of selecting an appreciable number of the leaders that attended the course. Unfortunately, the selection was not the best, and relatively few leaders that they recruited to receive IPEDEHP training remain active with the program.

It is for this reason that the decision was made to redefine the strategy for selecting community leaders. This strategy is now designed in coordination with the local counterparts, most of whom are members of the Peruvian Network for Human Rights and Peace and/or the National Human Rights Coordinator with whom IPEDEHP has had an ongoing relationship for as much as a

decade or more. These organizations, in turn, assume responsibility for selecting the community leaders.

5. *Community leaders are increasingly engaging in activities that go beyond just training. The challenge is how to support these initiatives without creating dependency on IPEDEHP or deviating the institution from its commitment to training in human rights and democracy.*

When IPEDEHP designed the training course for community leaders it did not imagine that these leaders, in addition to designing training courses, would create Human Rights Committees. Based on information currently available, the community leaders who have taken the course have created more than 25 Human Rights Committees. Some want to create shelters for abused women and children. The latter requires knowledge and financial support to develop, seek funding for, and implement small projects that permit them to achieve these objectives.

Organizations such as IPEDEHP can provide initial assistance to community leaders when they embark on activities such as these. However, providing ongoing assistance to carry out these activities would mean deviating the institution from its principal work which is educating in human rights and democracy.

Again, questions emerge:

- What institution will assume responsibility for providing technical support to the Human Rights Committees that the community leaders have established? Will it be the National Human Rights Coordinator to which the Committees have the right to affiliate once they become established?
 - Does the National Human Rights Coordinator have the capability to advise these small committees? Do its statutes permit this?
 - What institution will assist the community leaders who want to start shelters? Given that this is a major responsibility which has broader ramifications, it is realistic to think that the community leaders will be able to successfully take on activities such as these?
- 6. *The risk of creating expectations among the population that, over the long run, will not be satisfied.***

The very success of IPEDEHP and other institutions that promote human rights and democracy within the formal and non-formal education systems, and whose training has as a consequence committing graduates to achieve a multiplier effect, is in and of itself also a challenge.

As funding goes down, or when the institutions carrying these activities out opt for other priorities, there is the risk that support for these activities will either diminish or disappear. This could result in the very people they train to do a multiplier effect feeling abandoned as they are no longer receiving the support they used to receive.

In the case of IPEDEHP's program for community leaders, this does not constitute a risk for the immediate future, given that IPEDEHP expects to receive a second grant from USAID which will permit it to continue to provide follow up to the community leaders who received their training.

Nevertheless the question asked under the first challenge remains: what will happen when USAID financing is over and if there are no other sources of funding to support this program?

7. *Expanding coverage: strengthening linkages with the public sector*

The community leaders program represents the first time that the private non profit sector (IPEDEHP and the National Human Rights Coordinator) has entered into a formal agreement with a state institution in the human rights area (first the Peruvian Congress and later the Office of the Human Rights Ombudsman). IPEDEHP's experience working with the public sector is limited. The relation with the Office of the Human Rights Ombudsman is still in its early stages and the three organizations are going through a process of mutual learning. In the last few years the Ministry of Justice has asked IPEDEHP to design and deliver training programs under its auspices. However, this relationship is still in its incipient stages.

In the education sector, where it has directed its principal efforts, IPEDEHP works with teachers and school directors in response to specific requests. It also responds to requests from NGOs that work with teachers. However, IPEDEHP—by its own decision—has only signed agreements with regional dependencies of the Ministry of Education. It has yet to sign a formal agreement with the central office in Lima.

To date IPEDEHP has reached 13,000 teachers through direct actions and thousands more through the activities of 250 teacher promoters trained by IPEDEHP. While these are significant numbers, they only represent approximately 5% of Peru's teachers.

- What are the pros and cons of having IPEDEHP begin to enter into formal agreements with these and other state entities to carry out programs on a larger scale?

8. *As demand increases, how does IPEDEHP decide to prioritize its energies?*

To date, IPEDEHP—in its programs for teachers and for community leaders--has opted to serve Peru's poor and margined population, whose rights have been violated throughout history. However, the training program for community leaders has resulted in an enormous increase in demand for IPEDEHP's services that go way beyond these sectors.

The possibilities of what IPEDEHP can do in training in human rights are almost infinite.

A number of communities are soliciting assistance to integrate police and other municipal authorities into its training. There are also demands to work with young people within and outside of the formal education sector. IPEDEHP has been asked to prepare materials for primary school children.

In addition, for IPEDEHP and similar groups that would like to have a more profound impact, there is another sector that should be attended in the human rights arena: businessmen. It is also important to train the military in these themes as it is groups such as these (businessmen, military) who are the ones who often (deliberately or unconsciously) violate the rights of Peru's poor and marginalized population.

More questions:

- Who will respond to this demand: IPEDEHP or other members of the Peruvian Human Rights Education Network?
- What will be the effect over the long term, if these demands are not met?

9. *Should IPEDEHP maintain a low profile or should it increase its profile?*

When IPEDEHP was established its personnel took a deliberate decision to maintain a low profile. This made it possible to avoid jealousies and rivalries with other groups that work in the same area. In its early years, this strategy was very important because it made it possible for IPEDEHP to establish networks of trust with organizations in the educational community and those working in human rights throughout the country. An external evaluation of IPEDEHP, carried out in 1992, signals the downsides of modesty and maintaining such a low profile.

A key argument in favor of maintaining a low profile is that the institution does not represent a threat to other organizations that work in the same area. This permits IPEDEHP to continue working in concentrated activities and to refine its approach. An argument against IPEDEHP's maintaining a low profile is that today there is a more solid base of relations between IPEDEHP and the other groups that do human rights education. If IPEDEHP were to assume a higher profile it would be able to impact positively on the national agenda. In addition, the Peruvian business sector may be disposed to support human rights education, not just from an ethical perspective but with financial resources.

There are some that argue that this is a moot point. The same reality of Peru and the tremendous demand from teachers and community leaders has increased IPEDEHP's profile as an institution, regardless of its wishes or strategies.

Two questions emerge:

- What will IPEDEHP's answer be to this reality? Will it develop a strategic plan that takes this increase in its profile as a reality and work with it? Or will it try to minimize its profile which grows day by day?
- If it opts for the former, how to work in such a way that it simultaneously increases the profile of other organizations that are members of the Peruvian Human Rights Education Network?

10. *The importance of strengthening its capability to, on an ongoing basis, evaluate the impact of its programs.*

A generalized concern in the area of citizen education is that the methodology to measure the true impact of programs of this type is still in its infancy. Most evaluations limit themselves to describing the characteristics of the people who were trained and to identify, through pre- and post-tests, cognitive changes as a result of the training received.

This is a preoccupation of some of the donors that have supported IPEDEHP over the years. They want to see, as is to be expected, that their investment is having a positive impact. This is also a concern for IPEDEHP, who would like to see its work have appropriate repercussions in

the communities it works in, be it with teachers or community leaders. This is one of the reasons that USAID agreed to support the logistical expenses related to this study and for IPEDEHP's enthusiastic support for carrying it out.

More questions:

- For IPEDEHP and similar organizations, how can the evaluation of impact be integrated within its programs?
- For donors that support programs of this type, are they willing to accept the cost implications that are involved in carrying out impact evaluations are part of the program design?

11. IPEDEHP's future role

After 13 years of existence IPEDEHP sees the need to analyze its future. Should it remain an institution that devotes itself primarily to education in human rights and democracy or should it direct its efforts toward systematizing its experience and providing advice, leaving other institutions to do the actual training with its assistance?

If IPEDEHP opts for the first option, the increasing demands for its services will require it to hire more personnel. It will also require IPEDEHP to adopt a more aggressive strategy for generating funds, be it through charging for its services or looking for more funds from outside donors.

If the decision is to direct its efforts toward systematizing its experience and providing advisory assistance to others, this will also have implications in terms of the number and characteristics of its personnel, as well as its strategy for generating funds to cover its operating expenses

Whatever the road it adopts, this is the moment for IPEDEHP to carry out a strategic planning effort which will permit it to: (1) be clear on its objectives for the next 3 to 5 years; (2) decide on its internal structure as well as the number and characteristics of its personnel; and (3) assure the financing it needs to accomplish its objectives.

CHAPTER IX

WHY ADOPT IN PERU AND ELSEWHERE TRAINING PROGRAMS IN HUMAN RIGHTS AND DEMOCRACY THAT APPLY STRATEGIES AND METHODOLOGIES SIMILAR TO THOSE USED BY IPEDEHP?

This study has shown that the strategies and methodologies used by IPEDEHP result in effective training.

The results of the field study demonstrate that the training strategy used by IPEDEHP had a strong impact on an appreciable number of the people that were interviewed. Both the community leaders trained by IPEDEHP and the people they trained reported changes in their own lives. Many have also committed themselves to (and then subsequently followed through on) on carrying out a multiplier effect.

For human rights educators, for the human rights community in general, for individuals working in zones that are in or emerging from conflict, for donors there is an important question to be answered: why adopt in Peru or in other countries training programs in human rights and democracy that utilize strategies and methodologies similar to those used by IPEDEHP?

The answers are as follows:

1. ***What IPEDEHP offers is an integral program of education/action which touches the “meaning of life” of a number of the people that it trains, integrating basic values (dignity, respect, equality, valuing one’s self) within the context of one’s daily life. This creates a strong commitment to engage in a variety of activities that support human rights and democracy once course participants return to their communities.***

As we have seen above, this is not a theoretical training program in which people learn what the Constitution has to say about their rights. Instead a methodology is applied that integrates theory and action. The title of the training course says it well: *“You Have Rights: Know Them, Promote Them, Defend Them”*. The result is a committed leader.

2. ***The training strategy applied by IPEDEHP appears to have a strong impact on the direct beneficiaries and on people they, in turn, train or otherwise assist.***

The field study data summarized in Chapter VII demonstrate that the strategy used by IPEDEHP to train and commit community leaders is having a number of valuable impacts. Not having applied this methodology to other training program in human rights and democracy I do not have a basis for comparing whether IPEDEHP’s program is more effective than other programs. Nevertheless, the simple fact that these impacts appear provide a good argument for supporting programs of this type.

3. ***An effective manner of strengthening democracy by building social capital***

Robert Putnam, of Harvard University, and Francis Fukuyama—among others—have written well known books on the phenomenon of “social capital” which they consider to be a critical

base for democracy.³⁵ Social capital is something that people gain by working together in informal groups—be they social action groups linked to a church, groups that play cards together, choral groups, sports groups, etc. The fact that they collaborate with one another to carry out a volunteer activity, in which everyone is committed to a common objective, creates friendships and bonds of trust that are basic for the functioning of an effective democracy.

One of IPEDEHP's strengths is that—in everything it does—it consciously builds and strengthens networks of friendship, trust and commitment: between individuals (community leaders, teachers) and between organizations (networks of teachers trained in human rights; networks of community leaders trained in human rights; the Peruvian Human Rights Education Network).

Using the prior terminology, IPEDEHP creates “social capital” by strengthening groups involved in the field of human rights education. With that it develops relationships with individuals and organizations who it can reach out to when it needs help. IPEDEHP's work with the community leaders shows very clearly how IPEDEHP, as a result of years of assisting the members of the Peruvian Human Rights Education Network, can be assured help from the members of this network both to identify community leaders and to assist with follow after they are trained.

4. *The way in which IPEDEHP works is particularly valuable in societies that, having gone through major upheavals, are now faced with human rights violations that are less visible than those committed during the prior period of upheaval.*

IPEDEHP was born during a period of great violence generated by a wide variety of actors as one of several responses on the part of civil society to counteract this violence. One of the special characteristics of this training is that it touches on the affective. It promotes, among others, a space in which participants can remember the impact of earlier periods of violence on them, their families, and their communities. It also makes it possible to speak openly, and free of possible future consequences, about themes such as: increases in family violence, abuses on the part of the military which continue in some zones in Peru.

As is mentioned above, something very special about IPEDEHP is its methodology which helps to rebuild trust networks, which often have been severely strained or broken as a result of prolonged periods of violence.

5. *The way in which IPEDEHP works is also strategic in a society such as Peru where the government continues to violate the rights of its citizens through the legal system.*

The Peru of today, as I was informed by many people that I interviewed, is a country where human rights continue to be violated. The difference is that today these violations are not as visible as were the cases of extra-judicial proceedings and disappearances that characterized the 1980's and the early 1990's. Currently there are violations of human rights within the very legal system—in the development of numerous laws and other rulings that are not always submitted to public consultation before being put into effect.

As a prominent political scientist in Peru told me during an interview, it is precisely the type of training that organizations such as IPEDEHP provides, that is so critical for current times. Through programs such as these the public can learn what their rights are. At the same time,

³⁵ “Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy”, by Robert Putnam and “Trust: the Social Virtues of the Creation of Prosperity” by Francis Fukuyama.

they are given the instruments and strategies they need to demand that their rights be respected when they are violated.

6. *We are seeing, in the way IPEDEHP works, a good example of pressure for reform emerging from the bases.*

Throughout the world people are realizing that policy change is more permanent if it originates from the bases as opposed to being imposed from above. A strength of IPEDEHP's style of operations is that it helps forge relations between NGOs, grass roots groups, and the State. It has been doing this for years through its training programs for teachers and now through its training program for community leaders. Community leaders, representatives from local NGOs, representatives from municipalities and other State entities in the zone participate in IPEDEHP's training course for community leaders. Little by little, throughout Peru, one is seeing the formation of networks of people committed to the same ideals, who are organizing to demand their rights from the police, the military, and other authorities.

7. *Finally, the type of training that IPEDEHP delivers provides the vital link between a lack of knowledge of one's rights and the defense of one's rights.*

Through the training provided by institutions such as IPEDEHP, people are empowered. They learn their rights and where to go to get assistance when their rights are violated. Many community leaders are not content just to replicate the training they receive. Instead the training serves as a point of departure for entering the arena of political action (forming Human Rights Committees, DEMUNAS, giving personal advise, forming shelters for abused women and children, etc.)

As stated by a legal advisor in Puno: *"Legal defense is a consequence of the education in human rights that a person has received. If the education level is low, people have low self-esteem and don't go to institutions for help. Education is fundamental. It permits people to help us in defending their rights. If people didn't know their rights and that we exist we couldn't work."*

CHAPTER X CONCLUDING REMARKS

MORE QUESTIONS IN SEARCH OF ANSWERS

A year ago, when I began this study, I had no idea what I would find when I went out to the field to collect data. I knew, having reviewed the IPEDEHP materials and through conversations I had with personal from IPEDEHP as well as in the USAID/Peru mission, that there was something special about IPEDEHP's methodology. As a psychologist, I was fascinated with the fact that IPEDEHP's training incorporated affective elements. Beyond that, due to little experience in the area of human rights and the human rights education arena in particular, I had no clue as to what I was going to find.

I approached the task from the perspective of a psychologist/anthropologist interested in applying, as a pilot, a research methodology that I was convinced could be of great utility for a program of this type that works with leaders and has a strong empowerment focus.

The result has been the demonstration of positive impacts. Some--such as the attribution among some women of significant changes in their lives as a result of the IPEDEHP training and follow on—came as a surprise: to me, the IPEDEHP staff, and some of the people that reviewed the draft of this study.

Ideally, with sufficient time and resources, I would take advantage of the results of this first study—which offers a global panorama—to explore in more depth some the results obtained from the study. I would utilize a methodology similar to that which I used to carry out this study: each outcome would generate new questions which, upon obtaining responses to them, would generate yet further questions. I would also, as appropriate, add quantitative methodologies.

Among the questions that would be worth exploring in further depth:

- What is the explanation for why some women attribute to the IPEDEHP training a significant change in their lives similar to what, for others, might be accomplished through years of psychotherapy? ³⁶
- As I indicated in Chapter VII, I can only make inferences about community impact based on my interviews with community leaders and others in the community. A future study should investigate community level impacts in a more systematic fashion, utilizing a combination of quantitative and qualitative methodologies.
- If I had carried out this study in Lima, a large city with more than 8 million inhabitants, what would I have found? Would I have encountered community leaders who are as committed in their community to carrying out other activities in addition to workshops and brief presentations? Would I have also encountered people who attribute to the IPEDEHP training profound impacts on their lives?

³⁶ As I am not a clinical psychologist I would not want to venture to explain this result other than advancing some hypothesis which I included in Chapter IX.

- If I were to return to Peru 3, 4 or 5 years after the training would I find the same level of commitment as I found among people trained between 6 and 23 months after having been trained? How many would continue to be active in the defense of human rights? Would they have formed new groups during this period? How many initiatives focused on the promotion and defense of human rights would they have generated?
- What would happen to the commitment and personal impacts if IPEDEHP and its local counterparts were to stop providing follow-up after the training is over?
- What has happened with the 40% of the individuals trained by IPEDEHP who were not active in follow-up activities? Why did they not do any follow-up?
- To what extent are the impacts found in this study due to the selection of the leaders, their training, or their personal situations?

COMMENTS FROM PEOPLE WHO REVIEWED AN EARLIER DRAFT OF THIS STUDY AND WHAT I DID WITH THESE COMMENTS

I would like to conclude this case study with some comments on the fifth step in the methodology that I used to carry out this study: having submitted a draft of the document to a group of individuals, within and outside of Peru, for their comments.

At the beginning of November, 1998, during a visit to Peru, I had the opportunity to meet with all of the personnel of IPEDEHP to receive their feedback on the study along with their suggestions for strengthening it. I also, through both individual and group meetings, was able to get feedback from six individuals in the human rights community³⁷, two individuals from the Peruvian educational community³⁸, and two persons from USAID/Perú³⁹. Five community leaders who had received the IPEDEHP training course (4 whose cases are highlighted in Annex A), also provided feedback on the report.

Outside of Peru I was able to receive comments from the Executive Director of the Latin American Counsel for Adult Education (CEAAL), two European donors that have supported IPEDEHP, and a psychologist who currently lives in Europe who, in prior years, collaborated with the Peruvian Human Rights Coordinator in its program to provide psychological counseling to victims of political violence. I also received feedback from the representative for Peru from the Washington Office on Latin America (WOLA), an educational anthropologist who has experience with programs in Latin America with similar characteristics, and from a USAID official in Guatemala who was in charge of USAID/Peru's Democracy Office at the time that USAID decided to support IPEDEHP's program for community leaders.

³⁷ The current Executive Director of the Human Rights Coordinator in Peru; two people who were past Executive Directors of the Peruvian Human Rights Coordinator; two distinguished priests who are active in the liberation theology movement who had, as I, participated in IPEDEHP's training course for community leaders; a leader in the human rights movement in Peru that has accompanied IPEDEHP since it was established.

³⁸ The Executive Director of Foro Educativo and an educator who works with an NGO called Tarea.

³⁹ The person responsible for backstopping the IPEDEHP project and the USAID Mission Director.

Collectively, the comments that I received were excellent. Almost everyone was in agreement with the structure and organization of the document. The community leaders agreed that the data I reported on from my interviews with them were accurate.

However, there were some very good recommendations for improving the text of the study report, among them: the need to broaden and strengthen the section on the context (Chapter IV) and the need to include more detail in Chapter VI where the training program for community leaders is described. One individual who reviewed this study provided some valuable suggestions regarding questions that should be explored in a future study of IPEDEHP's community leader program. I incorporated most of them in the last section.

What generated the most discussion was the tone of the study. For some, especially those who had participated in IPEDEHP's training course for community leaders as I had or who knew IPEDEHP closely, the positive tone seemed appropriate because it concurred with their impressions. As stated by a highly respected priest in Peru who attended the training course: *"I am a skeptic. I don't comment on what I haven't seen or touched. I saw and I touched and it is as the study said."*

Nevertheless, for some who didn't participate in the training course or who only know IPEDEHP from a distance, the tone of the study seemed overly positive. For them it was difficult to imagine that a training course of only three days could have such a strong impact on participants. One person expressed doubts about the veracity of the testimonies, observing that often Peruvians don't say what they think and that it would have been better to see the actual changes rather than listening to people's testimonies. In addition, for some, the observations on IPEDEHP as an institution seemed overly positive.

These individuals recommended, among others, that I: (a) qualify some of the data that appear in Chapter VII and (b) strengthen the discussion on challenges that appears in Chapter IX.

As the researcher who carried out the study, I cannot change the testimonies as this is what the people told me and I have to respect what they said, although it is possible that some spoke with an excess dose of enthusiasm. However, I changed the study to: (a) add some elements on the context in Chapters IV, V, and VI; (b) provide more specificity on some of the results reported in Chapter VII; and (c) strengthen the section in Chapter VIII that refers to challenges. In addition, I did a careful review of the tone of the document.

I hope that this study serves as:

1. A small contribution to the field of education in human rights and beyond to: (a) share with others what I consider to be an excellent example of a training program that has positive repercussions on the people trained, their families, and members of their communities; (b) pilot a methodology that could be used, with enhancements, to measure the impact of other programs that seek to empower leaders to work more effectively in their communities.
2. Food for reflection. As we saw, the study began in Chapter I with a series of questions. It finishes in this chapter and in Chapter VIII with additional questions.

After carrying out this study I was able to ascertain that training in human rights and democracy is still in its infancy in many areas of the world, perhaps a little less so in Peru than elsewhere. While there have been many advances, there is still a long road to travel. However, if there were

no questions in search of answers, then there wouldn't be a motivation to continue learning and improving.

ANNEXES

ANNEX A FOUR CASES

This annex is directed to the reader who wants to have a more complete appreciation of some of the cases selected for this study and how I, as the researcher, wrote them up. I have chosen four cases: two women who work together to promote human rights and democracy in a small city in the jungle of Peru; a lady who works in a large city in the mountains; and an indigenous man also from the jungle who works in a small town. The cases are true. However, the names of the individuals have been changed.

Each case summary includes a brief description of the community leader, his/her opinion of the training received from IPEDEHP; a summary of what the community leader did with the training upon returning to his/her community; and the repercussions of that training on the community leader, his/her family, and others in the community who he/she affected upon returning from training

1. TWO COMMUNITY LEADERS LIVING IN THE PERUVIAN JUNGLE WHO, AFTER THE TRAINING COURSE, DECIDED TO WORK TOGETHER⁴⁰

María and Rosa live in a small city in the Peruvian jungle that has a population of approximately 50,000 habitants. Although they do not live in a zone directly affected by narco-traffic⁴¹, the area they live in was affected by the violence of the MRTA of which there continue to be repercussions.

María is 35 years old. She is married and has two children, 8 and 12 years of age. She lives with her husband, a carpenter who did not complete primary school and who works out of a workshop attached to their house. Maria finished secondary school and was studying to be a nurse when she married. She was selected to attend the IPEDEHP training course because she was the president of the women's club that she established in her community.

Rosa is 42 years old. She has four children between the ages of 7 and 23. Rosa completed five years of primary school. Her husband, also with a fifth grade education, works in naturalist medicine. Rosa was selected to attend the training course because she promoted the organization of a women's club in her community and a soup kitchen.

⁴⁰ I was accompanied by María and Rosa during my visit of a day and a half to their city. I interviewed them in their houses, at a restaurant, at the thermal baths outside of their city where we took their children on an outing. The other interviews were done in their houses (spouses and children), in the Human Rights Office that they established and in the offices of the people I interviewed: the Prefect, the District Attorney, and a lawyer.

⁴¹ During the coca harvest many people from the region go to nearby areas where coca is grown in order to participate, as paid laborers, in the harvest. Some people in this region also plant coca, but the numbers are very limited.

Two years ago, before attending the IPEDEHP training course, Rosa and María told me that they knew nothing about human rights. Both were housewives who dedicated their time to their husbands and children. When the town Prefect asked if they would like to attend the training course, they both saw an opportunity. They asked permission from their husbands to attend the course. One gave his permission and one didn't. Nevertheless they both decided to go to the course. María and Rosa received their training from IPEDEHP 23 months before the interviews took place.

Their reactions to the IPEDEHP training course

In Rosa's words: *"When I began the course I saw people united, committed to defending their rights. I always thought of myself as a brave woman, but with what I learned at the training course I felt more committed to defend rights. I felt capable. There were problems in my home but it was important to learn my rights."* María observed: *"The course impacted me as a person. I listened to the people who spoke. When they spoke they said that rights were for everyone. I felt very small when I began the training course. However when I listened to others, I began to feel important. My spirits were lifted. I was motivated to share what I had learned with my family when I returned home."*

Both commented on the dynamics and the games. María: *"There were many useful dynamics, for our children as well as our husbands and our parents. It permits them to acquire confidence, to learn to participate in the house. When I returned from the course, my children wanted to play the human rights game called 'Carrera del Diagnóstico'. I began playing it with my husband and my daughter. My husband said to my daughter, 'Instead of playing ball you should learn this game so that you can teach it to your classmates in school. Since you like this game, you have to learn to defend yourself. This game has valuable information on children's rights.' We played the game on Sunday afternoons. We also played the game with my sisters and my brothers-in-law. When one of my sisters comes to visit she always wanted to play the game."*

Rosa: *"The game helped me fit better within a broader society. Through the games we have learned to like ourselves, to have self-esteem. I began by playing the game with my husband when I returned from the workshop. He helps me to understand the value of each card. He said this game helps us to understand each other better. That is when I started picking up confidence in myself."*

Rosa adds *"My seven year old son likes the game. He has shared what the human rights are and how to defend them with his classmates at school. He says we all have rights but we shouldn't be abusive. His teacher asked me, 'Where did your son learn these things?' I told her. As a result the teacher invited us, through the director at her school, to come to the school to teach children about their rights."*

The impact of the training on Rosa and María.

María: *"My life changed completely. In my home I learned to value myself as a woman. My self-esteem went up. I learned how to maintain equality in my house. I was able to achieve better dialogue with my husband. The Maria of before tended to be angry, was proud, impatient, wanted to do more than her husband, was machista with her children, did not have her self-esteem well placed. The Maria of today has overcome machismo and pride, she is more patient with her children and her husband, she thinks more of her children's future, she understands that it is thanks to the efforts of her husband that she can work as a volunteer in human rights."*

Many people admire us, even though we are humble they respect us because they know we concern ourselves with other people's problems. When you don't have your self-esteem well placed you grow up in fear, you cannot face problems. Acquiring self-esteem one can dialogue with others. Without self-esteem we are not capable of dialoging, listening. I have learned to like myself."

Rosa: *"The Rosa of yesterday was egotistical, authoritarian with her children 'machista'. She thought that only she existed. She didn't value her husband. Today I am another person. I have trust with my children as if they were my brothers, we are all equal. I feel proud that the population accepts us as women. After the training we felt more committed. We didn't feel as though we were alone."*

How they have applied what they learned at the course in their communities

María and Rosa started by helping to do consciousness raising among the people in their community. They took advantage of some additional short presentations to get to know the people better in their community, to understand their problems. They realized that the people who attended their short courses, who were very humble, wanted to know their rights and how to defend them. Rosa observes: *"They didn't feel capable of defending themselves when they were accused of terrorism or narco-trafficking."*

People began coming to them to share their problems. They visited small communities outside of their city to see if the problems were true. Then their work began to grow. They were new at this. María *"We talked among ourselves. What are we going to do with all the problems the people are bringing to our attention?"*

So they decided to go to the police, the Prefect, and the municipality to make these problems known. Rosa: *"We said that we wanted to do something to stop the injustices we were seeing. At the beginning the people we went to made fun of us. We didn't have any certification; only a diploma from IPEDEHP that we had photocopied and reduced. They began by throwing us out of their offices. They told us we were the lawyers of the terrorists, that we should go work with them. Then the District Attorney lent us his support and little by little the other authorities have lent us their support."*

María: *"This is how we decided to form the Human Rights Committee—the two of us plus two other community leaders who attended the IPEDEHP course. There was a swearing in and the next month we organized a replica of the IPEDEHP course for 49 community leaders. The Prefect, the governors of the nearby communities, 10 representatives from indigenous communities, community leaders, and leaders of community security forces attended. We got donations from various institutions for the course, among them from the municipality and the parish. Only one person from the regional government didn't understand and gave us problems. The rest were very content with the course and they congratulated us."*

Rosa: *"We now have 49 promoters who are committees to working in favor of human rights. Each month they give us a listing of cases they have resolved. We visit the small communities to verify their data."* Rosa and Maria observed that now, during the campaign for municipal

elections,⁴² many people want to be human rights promoters. *“However, we tell them no because we do not want to confuse the promotion of human rights with political participation”.*

Immediately after their training course María and Rosa went to the office of the District Attorney. He offered all the support necessary so that they could orient people in their rights and asked what he needed to do to help.

To date María and Rosa have done a great deal to defend and promote human rights in their city. In addition to doing a replica of the training they received from IPEDEHP, they have responded to numerous requests to give presentations on human rights in their city and in small nearby communities. Through the Human Rights Committee which they established and where they attend approximately 15 cases a day, three days a week, in an office that has been lent to them in the headquarters of the Prefect. They listen, orient and accompany people who seek them out to assist them with problems such as: violation of minors, family violence, marital conciliation, assistance to pregnant mothers, abandonment of the home by spouses, payment for food for children by the parents that abandoned the home, etc.

They commented that they have had five “strong” cases of people who were unjustly accused and imprisoned: one due to terrorism, two for nacrotrafficking, a girl jailed without any accusation, and a person accused of sexually violating another person. In all instances, they have been successful in getting the people released from jail.

In 1997 they were responsible, for six months, for a radio program on human rights which they also used to familiarize the population in their region with the existence of the Human Rights Committee that they started. Also, in 1997, they issued a five minute radio spot that addressed the topic of human rights. They have organized marches to protest violence against women. They are working with the director and teachers of a primary school attended by their children to introduce human rights in the primary curriculum. They want to create a shelter for abused children. They have donated land and, through a program financed by USAID, have submitted a proposal to built the shelter. *“The mayor said that if we make the proposal and get the funding, he will help us.”*

Regarding the principal changes they have seen in their region

María and Rosa observed that a number of changes have occurred in their region as a result of their efforts:

- (1) Increased confidence in the Human Rights Committee and in the Office of the Human Rights Ombudsman. *“ People know what their rights are and when to do when they are violated, even people living in rural areas. Everyone respects us, we help others to be respected”.*
- (2) Increased confidence of the population in the local authorities. *“Before there was a major confusion. When people were abused they did not go to the authorities because they had no confidence in them.”*
- (3) *“The self-esteem of women has increased, beginning with our own households. Women come to us to tell us ‘Before we tolerated what our husbands did to us. Now we know how to defend ourselves’. There is more dialogue between couples. This avoids the need for a judicial process.”*

⁴² The municipal elections were programmed for October 11, 1998. The interview was carried out in the middle of May of 1998.

(4) *“With the prisoners in jail, we are beginning to see an increase in the self esteem of the women. Now, when we enter the jail, the prisoners come to us to seek our help. We feel very committed. If they are human beings, they have the same rights”.*

María observed: *“They now call us ‘doctors’. This makes us uncomfortable. We aren’t doctors. We are human rights promoters”*

INTERVIEWS WITH OTHERS ON MARIA AND ROSA’S WORK

A leader of a campesino civil defense group that was trained by María and Rosa: *“We established the civil defense group a year ago. In the fight for peace and development of our isolated communities we have problems of violence and delinquency. They (Maria and Rosa) are the right people to help us learn more about pacification. They give talks in our communities about human rights. I am very grateful to them. I consider them true Peruvian patriots”.*

Another community promoters trained by María and Rosa. *“I really liked the training. I could understand what women’s and children’s rights were, the realities of Peruvian laws, and how not to commit abuses. We participated in the workshops, we presented, we reached our own conclusions, we expressed our views. María and Rosa resolved the problem of a soldier who was found dead by his companions and then unjustly accused someone in our community of having killed the person when in reality it was another soldier who killed him”.*

“Before people didn’t take any interest when an injustice was committed. They were scared, they didn’t want to make a denouncement. Little by little we are taking interest. The ladies are demonstrating that there can be justice. People come to them.”

The town District Attorney. The District Attorney dedicates himself primarily to prison and civil affairs. He sees all the prison cases in his town. *“María and Rosa have a very important role. They are the linkage between justice and the humble people. The people identify with them. These ladies, in a disinterested fashion, provide them with education and counsel and bring us their concerns. They do not abandon just causes. They let the authorities know.”*

I asked about the impact of Maria and Rosa’s work in their town. He responded: *“Yes they are having an impact. It is constant and increasing. They work unceasingly. They sacrifice themselves in a disinterested fashion. It is useful to have them as allies.”*

A lawyer in the town. *“The work they do is known in our community: the police, the office of the District Attorney, the mass media. Many people admire them because they speak up when there is injustice. They take charge of assuring that mothers and children receive food. They deal with unjust detention of the campesinos. It is an admirable work. I see them with the people every day, visiting the District Attorney or looking for another means of defense. The women know what their limitations are. They have received training elsewhere. They are always recognized in ceremonies at the level of the mayor.”*

Visit to a sixth grade classroom in the school where María and Rosa are doing training in human rights. According to the sixth grade teacher: *“Through the second grade teacher (teacher of Rosa and María’s children) and with María and Rosa’s assistance, I am teaching human rights to my students”.* He showed me his “carpetas” and games. The walls of the classroom had three posters on human rights, one prepared by IPEDEHP.

I spoke with the students. I asked them what their rights were and they answered accurately. I asked if they had played the human rights game. They said that they had and that they like it.

HOW ROSA'S HUSBAND REACTED TO HER WORK IN HUMAN RIGHTS

According to Rosa, her husband had a number of problems with her attending the IPEDEHP training. He was resentful when she left to attend the course. This became worse when she returned as she began to leave the house, often for hours, to promote human rights. Her husband told me, when I interviewed him, that at the beginning this was a blow to him. *“Women should remain in their houses. When they leave you never know what they are doing. They could even be going out with other men”*.

The situation got worse when Rosa was invited to the first annual meeting of human rights promoters in Lima a year latter. She told him she was going and he was so upset he wanted to break off their relationship. She went to the meeting with her younger son. She didn't know if, after her return, the marriage would continue.

When she returned her husband asked for her forgiveness. Rosa said she would only reconcile with him if he permitted her to continue leaving the house to promote human rights. He agreed and since then—although there have been differences at times—the situation has been worked out.

Now when she isn't in the house, he and the children have become accustomed to preparing meals and do cleaning, tasks they never did before.

It is clear that the husband is very proud of his wife. She now has an increased status in the community and he recognizes it. When I interviewed him he told me that in his work as a “medico naturista” (naturalist doctor) in the countryside he encounters a number of human rights violations, especially abuse of men towards their wives. He counsels them from what he learned from his wife. He also makes referrals to the Human Rights Committee.

2. *A LAWYER IN CHARGE OF A DEMUNA (DEFENSE OF WOMEN'S, CHILDREN'S AND ADOLESCENT'S RIGHTS) IN A DISTRICT OF A LARGE CITY IN THE MOUNTAINS*⁴³

Carmen is 42 years old. She has a masters degree in law. She lives with her husband and her three daughters who are 19 and 18 years old and 8 months in a low income district in the outskirts of a large city in the mountains of Peru. This zone was not affected by the political violence.

Carmen has been committed to human rights since she was 8 years old when she saw how her mother was mistreated in her attempt, as the head of the family, to obtain fertilizer and water for her land. At the time she became angry and intervened in order to make sure he mother got water. It was at this point that she decided to study to be a lawyer with the objective of defending the rights of poor people. She has been the director of the DEMUNA in her district for

⁴³ I did the interview with Carmen and her children in their home. The other interviews were carried out visiten the institutions (health center, municipality, police precinct) in the community where Carmen works.

two years. She attended the training course a year ago, invited by the human rights ombudsman in her community.

Carmen continues to be very committed to the cause of human rights. She sleeps between 11:00 P.M. and 3:00 A.M. Between 3:00 and 5:00 A.M. she does her daily planning. Between 5:00 and 6:30 A.M. she attends rights concerns of the public. Afterwards she dresses and goes to work at the DEMUNA. When she returns at 6:00 P.M. there is usually a line of people waiting for her assistance. On Saturday and Sunday mornings she organizes workshops on human rights.

There are few activities in the area of promotion of human rights that Carmen has not carried out since attending the training course. Within a year of taking the course she had replicated the IPEDEHP training eight times (including doing a pre- and post-test and giving certificates to the trainees). She also prepares the participants to apply what they have learned and is attempting to do follow up with them. She has trained five university students to help her carry out the replicas. She has given a large number of talks on diverse topics related to democracy and human rights. Daily she provides counsel to people that request it both at the DEMUNA and in her home. She participates in a weekly radio program on human rights sponsored by the university in her city. She recently established a School for Parents in which parents of students receive counseling in parenting skills, including the psychological, social and legal aspects of their children's development. She supports the legal aspect.

Carmen is clearly a leader in the human rights area: she directs an organization of all the DEMUNAS in her city. She is also a member of a committee that coordinates to carry out campaigns to stop violence against women.

Her colleagues that I interviewed commented that, since Carmen took charge of the DEMUNA, there has been a great deal of activity. In addition to helping people that come from the outside she also assists people from within the municipality that seek her assistance. The day I visited the DEMUNA Carmen was preparing a case against a policeman who had abused a woman.

Following IPEDEHP's methodology, Carmen tries to organize training courses that have heterogeneous groups. People participate from the community, from the mayor's office, from the police, the health center, the school and the public ministry, among others. In her courses she places a great deal of emphasis on the need to work in a coordinated fashion. This was something that the people I interviewed who had participated in her courses very much like. In addition to learning new concepts about democracy and human rights, they were developing networks. One policeman that I interviewed placed special emphasis on this point.

What Carmen thought of the IPEDEHP course

Carmen was very impressed with the training course she received from IPEDEHP. She told me that before, when she gave talks or course on human rights, the participants fell asleep because she only lectured. Now the people love her training courses because they are interactive and fun and people learn things from each other. She told me, with pride, that when the courses finish people don't want to go

About the participation of police in her courses

Carmen commented that her first experience with police was in a course she offered in a rural community. The police had requested the course. Since then she has included multisectoral

groups when she organizes training courses. She said that before the police were very hesitant to channel denouncements to her at the DEMUNA and the health center. Now they refer people to both places.

She shared a “simpático” experience with me. One day she went out to a province where she had given a training course in which police had participated. She found a policeman who told her he had had been practicing what he had learned. The policeman asked her if she had more materials that he could use.

The impact of the IPEDEHP training course on Carmen

“It has left me feeling small. I feel important but impotent to satisfy everyone. In addition to finding the interactive training methodology to be effective, I feel I now listen better. I now understand the need to listen to what others have to say so that we can learn from one another. Before I had a tendency to lecture and people got bored.” Carmen also added that the training course had helped her with her daughters—to understand them better, to understand that they are human beings. She said that she is now more tolerant.

The impact of the training course on her family.

Carmen commented that, although her husband is not a human rights activist, he supports her. Her 18 and 19 year old daughters have been involved in human rights since they were small. Both commented, during my interviews with them, that they admired their mother and consider her to be a model. Along with Carmen, her daughters are determined to educate their 8 month old sister in an environment that respects her rights.

INTERVIEWS WITH PEOPLE THAT CARMEN HAS INFLUENCED

Carmen’s two older daughters. According to her older daughter, Carmen has always been involved in human rights. She attended one of the courses given by her mother since she took the IPEDEHP course and saw that the women who attended the course learned a great deal about their rights. She commented that the women said that before they didn’t know they rights but that they now know them. For this they are content. The other daughter added that in the training courses given by her mother the participants always create a song on human rights. They are pretty songs based on local tunes. People continue singing the songs after the workshop.

I asked if the methodologies used by Carmen to deliver courses had changed since she received training from IPEDEHP. They responded that she now uses dynamics to break the ice. They note that the training is much more active.

They told me that when their mother returned from the IPEDEHP training course she told them what she had learned. They played the games. One of the girls commented that she had to dance and do a proclamation. She added that she learned a great deal from the games. The other daughter indicated that, through the games, she learned the opinions of others. *‘It makes us cry’*. They told me that on Sundays they have family meetings. They talk of human rights and politics, among others. Each member of the family gives his/her opinion.

A nurse in the health center, trained by Carmen: The nurse is in charge of the center’s tuberculosis, school and adolescent health, and epidemiology programs. She is finishing her masters degree in public health. She met Carmen four years ago. They work closely together

coordinating topics related to women's health as well as child and adolescent health. She commented that Carmen is very dynamic, that she likes to coordinate. When they celebrated children's right week, Carmen was the key promoter of the events.

She found the course that Carmen provided after receiving the IPEDEHP training to be very valuable. She liked the methodology. It was a mixed group. *"The games were excellent. I accordance with our reality, not sophisticated. One can give one's opinion without feeling ashamed"*. She commented that in the training course she participated in there were ten policemen, some with uniforms, others not. At the beginning they were very serious. Later they become more relaxed. By the end of the course they were so enthusiastic that they suggested that everyone have dinner together to celebrate such an excellent course.

She observed that the training course had permitted her to acquire new knowledge, update what she already knew about laws dealing with human rights and their interpretation. She said it was now easier for her to explain laws to others. She also indicated that it was useful to understand self-esteem as seen from a legal perspective. As a nurse, she had dealt with self-esteem from a psychological perspective.

A colleague that supports Carmen at the DEMUNA. She participated in one of Carmen's training courses. She very much liked the dynamics which permit people to get people to know what each person thinks. In the course that she participated in the police received the best grades. Carmen developed the legal aspect well and got the police to present the problems as they saw them. She commented that, as a result of having attended the training course, the police work in a more coordinated fashion with the DEMUNA. *"The training course helped in part to have a better understanding of human rights issues and have clearer concepts."*

She also commented on the impact of the training on her *"When I began the training course I had little knowledge of human rights. After the course I could express what I thought. It helped me at home. I played the games with my mother and my brothers. My 16 year old brother began to laugh. It established a nice family atmosphere. Now I feel more important, more interested in learning. The course helped me a great deal. I have discovered that it is important to put oneself at the same level of the people with whom one is working."*

The political governor in the district where Carmen works: The political governor commented that many people come to him with problems with their marriages and that he sends them to Carmen. He so admires Carmen's capacity that he sent one of his assistants to a course that she organized. He commented that before the course many women didn't know their rights. There was also the problem that when a battered woman went to the police, she had to go to the hospital in the center of the city where she paid 10 Soles (\$3.50) to receive a certification that she had been maltreated. As a result of the course, the police now know that they can refer the women to the health center in the district where they can get the certificate free of charge. He also commented that the training course had increased the self-esteem of women. Now they know their rights and that their husbands cannot mistreat them.

Two policemen, one trained by Carmen and one not. I first interviewed a policeman who had not attended the training course. He indicated that, although he had not attended the course, he heard that it had been very successful. He commented that the policemen who attended the course shared the information their received at the course with himself and his colleagues at the police precinct. They also gave talks to the other policement. They spoke of family violence and

the need to give more attention to children. He indicated that he had learned from the policemen who had been to the course that children had the right to denounce their parents without being accompanied by an adult. He believes that one outcome of the course was more consciousness about human rights among all the policeman at the station.

The policeman who had attended the course qualified it as “magnificent”. He said he liked everything, that he had never attended a course with such a participatory methodology. At the beginning he thought he was going to waste his time, but he soon realized he was wrong. He liked the games and the activities that involved group participation. He was able to share his views with others in his group.

He observed that as a result of the course, which had as its principal theme “eliminating violence against women”, he learned how to assist abused women when they came to the police station—where to send them, and how to treat them gently and with respect. He came out of the course with a better understanding of their situation. *“Now we can do something about these problems. The course is very necessary. Everyone should take it”*

3. ***AN INDIGENOUS MAN WHO LIVES IN A SMALL TOWN IN THE JUNGLE***⁴⁴

Jorge is a member of the Shipibo Indian tribe. He lives in a small town in the jungle which is 15 minutes by car from a city that has a population of 100,000 inhabitants. The zone where he lives was affected by the violence of the MRTA and the military. One can still find MRTA cells in this zone and, because it is still considered a coca region, the zone continues under a “state of emergency”. The presence of the Marina (a group of the armed forces that is known for being very hard on the population) in the zone is very difficult for the inhabitants. In prior years, under suspicion for being a terrorist, Jorge had to leave the region. He was invited to visit Europe. Over a period of a year, he traveled to a number of countries where he gave presentations on indigenous life in the jungles of Peru.

Jorge is 35 years old. He finished secondary school and has completed five years at the university: two studying sociology and three studying law. His dream is to finish his studies so that he can become a lawyer and defend the rights of indigenous groups in the jungle. He also wants to write a history of the Shipibo tribe and have his own radio station. Whatever he does he always wants to teach and defend human rights.

Jorge currently works as a radio announcer. He runs a radio program that comes out every night for a half hour and for an hour on Saturdays. From Monday to Friday he provides national and local news and does interviews. The Saturday program is dedicated to human rights. The themes he has focused on include: violence against women, civil rights, and children’s rights, among others. He makes a great deal of use of the IPEDEHP “carpeta” in his radio programs. He says it is very helpful.

⁴⁴ I did the interview with Jorge in four stages: (1) having dinner at a restaurant (2) travelling by boat to a Shipibo community and then while we were in a house in the community; (3) at a Shipibo festival in his community; and (4) before and after his daily radio program which I had the opportunity to observe.

The radio program, in Spanish and his native language, is directly principally to the native population and to Latinos who live in isolated areas in the jungle. The program used to be subsidized by a European donor. Since it now does not have financing, he spends a great deal of time looking for financing for the program from businesses and NGOs who pay to have announcements made on his program. In this way he pays the expenses for air time for his radio program

In 1992 Jorge was a candidate to the National Congress. During the time I visited him he was supporting a candidate for mayor of his community. The candidate was Shipibo.

Jorge is married. He has two small children. His wife, who is a pre-primary teacher, lives with the children in an isolated community in the jungle. Thus I could not interview her. Jorge visits his wife and children once a month.

What Jorge thought of the training he received from IPEDEHP

A little before attending the IPEDEHP course Jorge traveled out of the country where he received a 15 day course on human rights provided by an international NGO that specializes in human rights. He said that, although he thought the training was good, it was highly structured based on a lecture format.

According to Jorge, *“The IPEDEHP course was more fun, simpler so that people from small communities could understand it better. Although there was theory, I found the dynamics and the games particularly practical and effective for rural zones”* He indicated that he had never taken a course that was based on interactive methodologies. *“There were people of all levels: campesinos, indigenous people, political authorities. The trainers were very motivating.”*

How Jorge has applied what he learned at the training course

Since he attended the course a year ago, he has used what he learned in his radio programs. He has also participated with other colleagues in replicating the course: one in his community and one in a nearby city. He also did two more replicas in isolated indigenous communities. He gave and continues giving (with apparently a great deal of enthusiasm) talks on human rights, as part of a training program in leadership for indigenous women. He also offers talks on human rights at the bilingual pedagogic institute in his community. He particularly likes playing the games and confirms that the women love the games. He first trained other women as monitors. When they play the games, each works with a group, translating the cards when necessary.

The impact of the training on Jorge

Jorge responded as follows when I asked him about the impact of the course on himself: *“It was a novelty. I had been trained to give lectures. The training that IPEDEHP offers is between traditional and modern medicine. It is for everyone.”*

I asked if the course had an impact on his self-esteem. This was his answer *“I am more human. I feel freer. I like to meet new people.”*

His cousin, who was listening to the interview, responded: *“The people know him better, they think more highly of him, they value him more.”*

If he hadn't attended the IPEDEHP course

I asked Jorge how things would have differed had he not attended the IPEDEHP course.

His answer: *"I returned from being trained in human rights outside of my country prepared to write a monograph on human rights and the rights of indigenous communities. However, after taking the IPEDEHP course, I decided to not do the monograph, at least for the moment. The IPEDEHP training motivated me to train indigenous women in their rights. Without the IPEDEHP training I would have trained the women in a more traditional fashion. I would have always done the radio program but the IPEDEHP training helped me address more profound themes in a more popular, direct fashion. Without this training my radio program would have been more technical and I would have had a smaller audience."*

INTERVIEWS WITH TWO SHIPIBO LEADERS

Two female leaders of an indigenous women's organization in the zone have been working with Jorge for several years. They commented that since he returned from the IPEDEHP training he has helped them to incorporate themes related to human rights and democracy into the leadership training courses they provide for Shipibo women. One observed: *"He does a very nice job. They are very dynamic. There is a great deal of group work. He has motivated the women."*

The other added: *"The dynamics help to form the group. They force everyone to speak up. I had never played the games. The women were timid. But little by little they began to speak up. My 9 year old daughter says 'I have my rights'. She comes with me to the training courses. She is training other children about their rights."*

ANNEX B

PEOPLE INTERVIEWED ⁴⁵

IPEDEHP

Elva María Arangüena
 Luis Briceño
 Julio Carrasco
 Ingrid Cornejo
 Gustavo Espinosa Moncloa
 Wilian López
 Rosa María Mujica Barreda ⁴⁶
 Elsa Ruben de Celis
 Lila Tincopa
 Pablo Zavala

COMMUNITY LEADERS (20 cases)

Fernando Alfaro
 Kati Alarcón
 Liliana Alarcón
 Rosa Cabrera
 María Angélica Cárdenas
 Mercedes Chino
 Rocío Chu
 Lola Flores
 Oswaldo Horna
 Jesús Macedo
 Gustavo Medina
 Eduardo Ninaja
 Humberto Rodríguez
 Cecilio Soria
 Fernando Tintalla
 Otilia Torres
 Haddi Ucamina
 Manuel Vela
 Manuela Villanueva
 Luisa María Yufra

OTHER COMMUNITY LEADERS

Carlos Del Carpio

⁴⁵ This list does not include the large number of community leaders that I interviewed in Lima—individually and in focus groups—during the first annual meeting of community leader that took place in February, 1998. It also doesn't include the large number of individuals (spouses and children of the community leaders who took the IPEDEHP course, other people in the communities) that I interviewed during my field study.

⁴⁶ Executive Secretary of the National Human Rights Coordinator between 1992 and 1995.

Gustavo Corrales
 Julia Infantes
 Alberto Ojeda
 Rosa Soto

OTHERS IN PERU

Eloy Arribas, Radio Yaraví, Amakella, Arequipa
 Eliana Alarcón, Vicaría de Puno, Puno
 Walter Albán, First Adjunct Ombudsman, Office of the Human Rights Ombudsman, Lima
 Nancy Astete, Vicaría de Juli, Puno
 Carlos Basombrío, Institute for Legal Defence (IDL) Lima
 Violeta Bermúdez, United States Agency for International Development in Peru, Lima
 Jeff Borns, United States Agency for International Development in Peru, Lima
 Víctor Calizaya Coila, Legal Advisor, Vicaria de Puno, Puno
 Grover Castro, Ministry of Justice, Lima
 Néida Céspedes, TAREA, Lima.
 Alejandro Cussianovich, Lima
 Carlos Iván Degregori, Institute for Peruvian Studies (IEP), Lima
 Susana Galdós, Manuela Ramos Movement, Lima
 Gloria Helfer Palacios, former Minister of Education, founder of the Educational Forum,
 President of the Institute for the Promotion of Quality Education (EDUCA), Lima
 Father Hubert Lanssiers, member of the Commission to pardon people who were unjustly
 incarcerated as terrorists, Lima
 José Carlos Luciano, Legal Defense Institute, Lima
 Rolando Luque, Adjunct Human Rights Ombudsman, Office of the Human Rights Ombudsman,
 Arequipa
 Sofia Macher, Executive Secretary of the National Human Rights Coordinator, Lima
 Carolina Montes, Vicarage of Pucallpa
 Father Francisco Muguiro, Director of Diaconía for Justice and Peace of the Office of the
 Archbishop of Piura-Tumbes
 Lucy Muñoz, Director of CECYCAP, Arequipa
 Jorge Palomino, Ministry of Justice, Lima
 Henry Pease, Peruvian Congressman, Lima
 Hildy Quintanilla, Encuentros Casa de la Juventud, Lima
 Jorge Ramírez Reyna, Black Association for the Defense and Promotion of Human Rights, Lima
 Rafael Roncagliolo, Transparencia, Lima
 Pablo Rojas, Human Rights Commission (COMISEDH), Lima
 Jorge Santistevan de Noriega, Human Rights Ombudsman, Lima
 Ricardo Uceda, Diario El Comercio, Lima
 Oscar Vásquez, Center for Study and Action to Support Peace, (CEAPAZ), Lima
 Martín Vegas, Foro Educativo, Lima
 Rudecindo Vegas, Transparencia, Lima
 Susana Villarán, Legal Defense Institute Legal, Lima ⁴⁷
 Father Felipe Zegarra, professor of the Faculty of Theology at the Catholic University of Peru,
 Lima
 Father Gerald Villeaux, Executive Director of the Vicaría of Pucallpa
 Father José Manuel Miranda, Director of the Human Rights Committee of ICA (CODEH ICA)

⁴⁷ Executive Secretary of the National Human Rights Coordinator between 1995 and 1997.

OUTSIDE OF PERU

Hans Jurgen Brandt, Friedrich Naumann Foundation, Germany

Cynthia McClintock, The George Washington University, United States

Basilia Montes, Servicio de Paz y Justicia (SERPAJ), Paraguay

Jorge Osorio, President of the Council on Adult Education for Latin America (CEAAL), Chile

Gloria Ramírez, United Nations Cathedra for Human Rights, Autnonomous University of
Mexico, Mexico

Dina Rodríguez, Interamerican Institute for Human Rights,(IIDH), San José, Costa Rica

Eduardo Rojas, Vicaria de Pastoral Social, Chile

Michael Shifter, The Interamerican Dialogue, United States

Nico Van Leewen, Bilance, Holland

Coletta Youngers, Washington Office on Latin America (WOLA), United States

ANNEX C

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I owe my gratitude to many people, within and outside of Peru, for the time that they spent with me and their support in carrying out this study.

I would like to begin by thanking all the personnel of IPEDEHP: Elva María Aranguena, Luis Briceño, Julio Carrasco, Ingrid Cornejo, Gustavo Espinosa Moncloa, Graciela Jiménez, Wilian López, Rosa María Mujica Barreda, Justa Remigio, Elsa Rubín de Celis, Liliana Santivañez, Lila Tincopa and Pablo Zavala. All, in one way or another, helped me (with endless patience) in carrying out this study—be it permitting me to interview them, helping me to set up interviews while in Peru, reviewing drafts of the study, helping me with copying documents, doing mailings and transportation. A special thanks to Rosa María Mujica Barreda who took a draft of this document prepared in Spanish by a person whose native language is English and “translated it” into a comprehensible Spanish. Rosa María and Wilian López also helped me in drafting some sections of Chapters IV, V, and VI that focus on the overall context and the history of IPEDEHP. Many thanks to Ingrid Cornejo for her logistical support and for helping me to summarize some of the numerical data. It was an honor and a pleasure, throughout this process, to work with and come to know such a fine group of people.

Dr. Ray Chesterfield, an educational anthropologist with over 20 years working in education in Latin America, also deserves a special note of thanks. Before I went to the field he reviewed, in detail, the design of the study and the interview protocols. Ray also reviewed the data I obtained from the field and the methodology I used to summarize and analyze them. He also gave me excellent comments on earlier drafts of the study.

I would also like to thank USAID/Perú that provided the funding to cover my trips to and from Peru as well as within Peru. I would especially like to thank Jeff Borns, Director of USAID/Peru’s Democracy Office (who is now stationed in USAID/Guatemala) for his faith in my work and his hospitality during my visits to Peru. My thanks also to Violeta Bermudez, who is in charge of overseeing the IPEDEHP grant within Peru, for her help in organizing interviews and for permitting me to interview her. My thanks also to Cecilia Velasco, who works with Violeta, for her help in setting up interviews.

My eternal thanks to the 20 community leaders who shared their lives and their time with me as well as their families and members of their communities that I interviewed. I learned a great deal from them. As a result I have gained a great deal of respect for their courage, their creativity and their unceasing dedication to promoting human rights and democracy in Peru. The list includes: Luisa María Yufra, Gustavo Medina, and Jesús Macedo from Arequipa; Liliana Alarcón, Kati Alarcón, Mercedes Chino, Fernando Tintalla, and Eduardo Ninaja from the Department of Puno; María Cárdenas, Rocío Chu, Lola Flores, Otilia Torres, Manuel Vela, Rosa Cabrera, Manuela Villanueva, and Humberto Rodríguez from the Department of San Martín; and Oswaldo Horna, Haddi Ucamina, Cecilio Soria, and Fernando Alfaro, from the Department of Pucallpa.

There are also many people within and outside of Peru cited in Annex B who permitted me to interview them. To all of them, many thanks. Their observations have been very helpful and well used in the study.

Finally, my sincere thanks to the people who reviewed the draft of this study and provided their comments which were immensely useful in helping me to improve the final report. I include in this list: all the IPEDEHP staff, Susana Villarán, Sofía Macher, Pilar Coll, Carlos Basombrío, Father Hubert Lanssiers, Father Felipe Zegarra, Martín Vegas, Nélida Céspedes, Haddi Ucamina, Lola Flores, Otilia Torres, Cecilio Soria, María Luisa Yufra, Violeta Bermúdez, Tom Geiger, Jeff Borns, Ray Chesterfield, Jorge Osorio, Eduardo Rojas, Hans Jurgen Brandt, Nico Van Leewen, Coletta Youngers, and Bárbara Jochamowitz.

ANNEX D BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Andreopoulos, George J, and Richard Pierre Claude. *Human Rights Education for the Twenty-First Century*, University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1997.
- Ansi3n, Juan, Daniel del Castillo, Manuel Piqueras y Isaura Zegarra. *La Escuela en Tiempos de Guerra: Una Mirada a la Educaci3n Desde la Crisis y la Violencia*, Grafimace, S.A., Lima.1992
- Carrasco Carrasco, Julio. *Evaluaci3n Externa: Proyecto "Actividades y Programas para Educar en Derechos Humanos en la Escuela Primaria"*. Evaluaci3n encargada por Save the Children. Lima, 1995.
- Claude, Richard Pierre. *Educating for Human Rights: The Philippines and Beyond*. The University of the Philippines Press, Manila, 1996.
- Claude, Richard Pierre. *Methodologies for Human Rights Education*. Draft manuscript, 1998
Input for World Report on Human Rights Education.
- Comas-Diaz, Lilian, M. Brinton Lykes and Renato D. Alarc3n. "*Ethnic Conflict and the Psychology of Liberation in Guatemala, Peru, and Puerto Rico*". American Psychologist, Vol 53, No. 7, pp. 778-792, July, 1998.
- Degregori, Carlos Iv3n, Jos3 Coronel, Ponciano del Pino, y Orin Starn. *Las Rondas Campesinas y La Derrota de Sendero Luminoso*, IEP Ediciones. Lima, 1996.
- Fukuyama, Francis. *Trust: The Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity*. Free Press Paperbacks, New York, 1995
- Freire, Paulo. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* , The Seabury Press, New York, 1968
- Gorriti Ellenbogen, Gustavo. *Sendero: Historia de la Guerra Milenaria en el Peru*, Editorial Apoyo. Lima, 1990.
- Helfer, Gloria, Carlos Iv3n Degregori, Franciso Chamberlain, y Eduardo Rojas. *Evaluacion Externa del IPEDEHP*, 1992. Lima, 1992.
- Heinz, Wolfgang y Santiago Peraglio. *Informe de la Evaluaci3n de la Coordinadora Nacional de Derechos Humanos, 1992-1997*. Lima, 1997
- Instituto Peruano de Educaci3n en Derechos Humanos y la Paz, *Informe del Primer Encuentro Nacional de L3deres Sociales Promoters de los Derechos Humanos y la Democracia*. Lima, febrero de 1998.
- Instituto Peruano de Educaci3n en Derechos Humanos y la Paz. M3dulo para el curso-taller: *Tu Tienes Derechos: Conc3celos, Promuévelos, Defiéndelos*". Lima, 1996.

- Instituto Peruano de Educación en Derechos Humanos y la Paz . Game: *La Carrera al Diagnóstico* con tarjetas para líderes sociales. Lima, 1996.
- Instituto Peruano de Educación en Derechos Humanos y la Paz. Game: *Promoviendo el Debate*. Lima, 1996
- Instituto Peruano de Educación en Derechos Humanos y la Paz. *Boletín de la Red de los Líderes Promoters de Derechos Humanos*, Año 1, No. 1, Lima, 1998.
- Instituto Peruano de Educación en Derechos Humanos y la Paz. Video: *Tú Tienes Derechos: Conócelos, Promuévelos, Defiéndelos*. Lima, 1998.
- Instituto Peruano de Educación en Derechos Humanos y la Paz. Video: *You Have Rights: Know Them, Promote Them, Defend Them*. Lima, 1998.
- Instituto Peruano de Educación en Derechos Humanos y la Paz. Reports of the training courses for community leaders carried out in Arequipa, Cajamarca, Puno, San Martín, Pucallpa and Piura. Lima, 1997, 1998.
- Instituto Peruano de Educación en Derechos Humanos y la Paz. *Propuesta: Programa de Capacitación de Líderes Sociales en Derechos Humanos, Democracia y Participación Ciudadana*. Lima, 1997
- Instituto Peruano de Educación en Derechos Humanos y la Paz. *Informe Anual: Programa de Capacitación de Líderes Sociales en Derechos Humanos, Democracia y Participación Ciudadana*. Lima, 1997
- Instituto Peruano de Educación en Derechos Humanos y la Paz, Comic book: *Democracia*. Lima, 1998.
- Instituto Peruano de Educación en Derechos Humanos y la Paz, Comic book: *Derechos Humanos*. Lima, 1998.
- Krueger, Richard A. *Analyzing & Reporting Focus Group Results*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, California, 1998.
- Krueger, Richard A. *Moderating Focus Groups*. Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, California, 1998.
- McClintock , Cynthia. *Peru's Fujimori: A Caudillo Derails Democracy*. Current History, March, 1993.
- Miles, Matthew B. Miles an A. Michael Huberman. *Qualitative Data Analysis*. Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, California, 1994
- Morgan, David L. *The Focus Group Guidebook*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, California, 1998

- Mujica Barreda, Rosa María. *El IPEDEHP: Una experiencia de trabajo en educación en derechos humanos*. En: "Reflexiones a partir de la experiencia. Red Peruana de Educación en Derechos Humanos y la Paz. Lima, 1991.
- Mujica Barreda, Rosa María. "Educar en Derechos Humanos: reto y exigencia: La escuela como un espacio". En: "La Fuerza del Arco Iris". CEAAL. Santiago de Chile, 1988.
- Mujica Barreda, Rosa María. *La Realidad y la Posibilidad de las Escuelas Peruanas*. En: Desarrollo en Educación Primaria, Cedapp. Lima, 1993.
- Mujica Barreda, Rosa María. Carpeta para programa de capacitación de líderes sociales: *Tú Tienes Derechos: Concócelos, Promuévelos, Defiéndelos*, Instituto Peruano de Educación en Derechos Humanos y la Paz. Lima, 1996.
- Mujica Barreda, Rosa María y Gustavo Espinosa Moncloa. Carpeta: *Técnicas Participativas para Educar en Derechos Humanos y en Democracia*, Instituto Peruano de Educación en Derechos Humanos y la Paz. Lima, 1998.
- Nickoloff, James B. (editor). *Gustavo Gutiérrez Essential Writings*. Orbis Books, Maryknoll, New York, 1996.
- Putnam, Robert . *Making Democracies Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1993.
- Red Peruana de Educación en Derechos Humanos y la Paz. *Camino a la Tolerancia*. Lima, 1998.
- Red Peruana de Educación en Derechos Humanos y la Paz. *Detengamos el Maltrato Infantil*. Lima, 1998
- Red Peruana de Educación en Derechos Humanos y la Paz. *IX Encuentro Peruana de Educación en Derechos Humanos y la Paz*. Lima, 1996
- Red Peruana de Educación en Derechos Humanos y la Paz. *X Encuentro Peruana de Educación en Derechos Humanos y la Paz*. Lima, 1997.
- Red Peruana de Educación en Derechos Humanos y la Paz. *XI Encuentro Peruana de Educación en Derechos Humanos y la Paz*. Lima, 1998
- Red Peruana de Educación en Derechos Humanos y la Paz. *10 Años: la Red Peruana de Educación en Derechos Humanos y la Paz*. Lima, 1996.
- Rodríguez Macedo, Humberto *Tareas Psicológicas en un Contexto de Violencia Política en la Prelatura de San Martín*, Tesis Para la Facultad de Psicología, Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Martín. San Martín, 1996.
- Rubin, Herbert J. and Irene S. *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, California, 1995

- Rubín de Celis, Elsa. *Educación Peruana y Derechos Humanos: Los Maestros Opinan*, Instituto Peruano de Educación en Derechos Humanos y la Paz. Lima, 1990.
- Tincopa Calle, Lila and others. *Carpeta para maestros: Aprendamos Nuestros Derechos: Guía Metodológica para Educar en Derechos Humanos y en Democracia a Niños de 5 a 8 Años*. Instituto Peruano de Educación en Derechos Humanos y la Paz. Lima, 1996.
- Tincopa Calle, Lila, Silvia Grandal and Luis Guerrero Ortiz. *Carpeta para maestros: Aprendiendo a Educar en Derechos Humanos y en Democracia. Propuesta Curricular para la Educación Primaria*, Instituto Peruano de Educación en Derechos Humanos y la Paz. Primera edición. Lima, 1996.
- Tincopa Calle, Lila. *Curriculum y derechos humanos*. Instituto Peruano de Educación en derechos Humanos y la Paz. Lima, 1988.
- USAID/Peru. *Perú: Proceso Democrático 1992-1997*, January, 1998.
- Yin, Robert K. *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, California, 1994.

ANNEX E

ABOUT THE AUTHOR OF THIS STUDY

Marcia Bernbaum has 23 years of experience in international development, 20 with USAID as a human resources development officer and subsequently in senior management. Since 1996 Dr. Bernbaum has carried out consultancies in evaluation, strategic planning, and organizational development with an emphasis on supporting civil society through assisting NGOs.

In the field of evaluation, Dr. Bernbaum has been team leader for a number of evaluations of USAID programs, among them: girls basic education in Malawi; support for legislative reform in Bolivia; civil society support for transparent Presidential elections in the Dominican Republic in 1996; a program in which business leaders supported basic education and educational reform in the Dominican Republic.

Under contract to UNICEF, Dr. Bernbaum prepared an issues paper on the linkages between child labor and education for a world conference on child labor hosted by the government of Norway in 1997. She is also co-author of “USAID’s Strategic Framework for Basic Education in Africa” which offers guidelines for designing, implementing and evaluating basic education programs in Africa.

She has just published a case study, for international dissemination, on business leaders in the Dominican Republic based on the evaluation that she did. The title of the case study is “Business Leaders Promote Basic Education and Educational Reform in the Dominican Republic”

Dr. Bernbaum has a Ph.D. in Developmental Psychology from the George Washington University.

Those who have further questions about the methodology used to carry out the study and/or the results may reach Dr. Bernbaum at: mbern362@aol.com (e-mail), 202 362-3666 (telephone), or 202 362-7551 (fax).

ANNEX F

ORDERING INFORMATION

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ORDERING PAPER COPIES OF THE CASE STUDY

To obtain additional copies of this document in English, order number PN-ACD-920, contact USAID's Development Experience Clearinghouse, 1611 N. Kent Street, Arlington, Virginia 22209. Tel.: (703) 351-4006; fax: (703) 351-4039, or Internet: docorder@disc.mhs.compuserve.com.

To obtain copies of this document in Spanish, order number PN-ACD-921, contact USAID's Development Experience Clearinghouse, 1611 N. Kent Street, Arlington, Virginia 22209. Tel: (703) 351-4006; fax: (703) 351-4039, or Internet: docorder@disc.mhs.compuserve.com

There is no charge for the documents. However, the individual/institution requesting copies will be billed for handling and mailing expenses.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR OBTAINING ELECTRONIC COPIES OF THE CASE STUDY

Both the English and Spanish versions are also available electronically through the Internet at the following addresses:

English version: http://www.human-rights.net/IPEDEHP/study_english

Spanish version: http://www.human-rights.net/IPEDEHP/study_spanish

It is also possible to request the document in electronic form by sending an e-mail to IPEDEHP: ipedhp@amauta.rcp.net.pe. Please indicate if you want the English or Spanish version.